The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1898.

The Week.

The scores of thousands of operatives in New England cotton mills who received notice of a reduction in wages just before the end of 1897 were not the only class of working-people in that section to whom such a holiday gift was made. The employees in a great shoe factory at North Brookfield, Mass., have just been informed that their pay will be cut down with the new year, and the operatives in similar establishments elsewhere fear that the example thus set will be generally followed. The only reason assigned by the manufacturers is that they are losing money, and cannot continue the business unless they reduce the wage account. The company in question has always enjoyed a good reputation for fair treatment of its hands, and they are more disposed to accept the claim that the cut must be made in order to keep the shops going than is sometimes the case when such an announcement is made by an employer. A local newspaper says that "the people of North Brookfield hope that the peace and general good-will will not be interrupted by the present unpleasant situation."

Why do shoe manufacturers find that they cannot pay as large wages hereafter as heretofore? Has any change in the conditions of the industry occurred during the past year? There has been one change, which is of great importance. A tax has been put by the Dingley law upon the raw material used in making shoes. The new tariff imposes a duty upon hides. This duty was imposed against the earnest protests of shoe manufacturers, who insisted that it would seriously injure their business. Six months have not passed since the law went into operation, and already a reduction of wages is found to be inevitable. Such a showing cannot be a pleasing spectacle for Republican Congressmen who promised prosperity as soon as a Republican tariff should go into effect, and who must meet next fall the interrogatory of a host of workingmen why prosperity involves smaller pay for them.

The wheels of the reciprocity chariot are tarrying unconscionably. One brake on them is the fact that we cannot surrender a dollar of revenue, in the interest of reciprocal trade, without still further embarrassing our Treasury. How can we remit any part of the duty on sugar when we need the whole and more than the whole? The second great obstacle in the way of reciprocity is the fact that the men who moved heaven and earth to get a high duty put on their products do not now propose to surrender a fraction of 1 per cent. of it. It certainly does look like interfering with vested rights, and we know what an awful thing that is. Take the lumbermen, for instance. They lobbied through a duty of $2 on white pine, which, as they boasted, meant $6,000,000 clear to them, and now are they to be asked to give up any part of that honest profit for the sake of reciprocity with Canada? Why, the very suggestion fills them with disgust; and they have their secretary notify Reciprocity Commissioner Kasson that nothing of the sort must be attempted. All they are asking is a protection of 20 per cent., while they are cheerfully paying 40 or 50 per cent. on other people's goods. Does Mr. Kasson want to rob them of their little all? Reciprocity must be had, of course—it is in the platform; but the lumbermen never did think much of reciprocity with "nations in the same temperate zones as our own." Reciprocity they thought to be well understood as a matter only for the tropics and Dagoes—something far off, anyhow, and with no relation to lumber. And that is what they all say: Reciprocity to the top of your bent, but touch our duties if you dare!

We unite with our protectionist friends in rejoicing that at last the Dingley tariff has made both ends meet during a single month. It is true, the December "surplus revenue" of $1,714,831, reported on Tuesday by the Treasury, leaves a net deficit of $44,376,663 for the six completed months of the fiscal year. It is true, also, as Dingley and his friends reluctantly confess, that a heavy deficit in January is inevitable, which will remove still further from the domain of legislative sanity Mr. Dingley's estimate of $113,000,000 increase in the revenues of the fiscal year. Still, a surplus is a surplus, and no true-hearted protectionist need now hang his head. When the wicked jeeringly refer to the "Dingley Deficit," all that is necessary is to point to the December surplus, and ask by what right such a tariff as that can be called a deficit-maker. Meantime, if internal revenue receipts increase as they have done in the past six months, seven millions over the corresponding period of 1896, let it be remembered that this increase must be ascribed to the customs schedules of the Dingley law, while any general shortage in revenue during the next few years must be set down to "anticipatory importations." The polysyllables involved in this explanation have done, we can ourselves testify, great execution already in the ranks of the enemy, and they may be made to do service as long as deficits continue.

Commissioner Evans fully confirms the worst that has ever been charged against pension attorneys as a class. He points out that during the past thirteen years $13,000,000—a full million a year—has been paid to such attorneys, a large proportion of the vast sum for really trifling services. He shows how unscrupulous agents persuade veterans to enter claims against the Government which the old soldiers would never think of presenting if left to themselves, and make combinations with incompetent or conscienceless medical examiners to put through absolutely fraudulent applications. In many cases the old soldier is illiterate, and a shrewd attorney prepares almost any kind of affidavit that he wants, and directs the soldier to sign it, which the latter does in ignorance of what it contains. Commissioner Evans reports that the Bureau unearths sharp practice of one kind or another by these attorneys every day, and he sees no hope of a reform except by Government oversight of the business. With this change in methods the pension bureau would have *direct control of the attorneys*, whose business it would be to see that all honest claims were promptly and intelligently presented; and if one of them should fail to do his duty or should be found incompetent, it would be an easy matter to remove him. It is a great thing to have a Commissioner who realizes the abuses of the existing system so thoroughly as Mr. Evans does, and the McKinley Administration will be entitled to great credit if it shall carry through the reforms which he advocates.

When the bill prohibiting pelagic sealing was on its hasty passage through Congress, the whole stress was laid on our duty to do what we asked other nations to do. We were asking the Canadians to give up pelagic sealing, and yet were open to the taunt that Americans were not above taking seals on the high seas. Let us make the nefarious business unlawful for our own citizens, and then our "moral position" will be much stronger in calling upon other nations to abandon it. That was the argument before the bill passed. But no sooner had it passed than it was found to contain a clause absolutely prohibiting the importation of sealskins or of articles made of sealskin. No sealskin muff or purse, no article of wearing apparel in which sealskin is even a part, can pass through our custom-houses without being ripped to pieces to see if the pelt carries the proper

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stamp. No lady going abroad can safely take a sealskin coat along without a "certificate of ownership" from the Collector of the port; otherwise, this, too, on her return, will be torn open for examination. That is to say, while ostensibly passing a bill to prohibit pelagic sealing, we were really making a law to prohibit importation of sealskins. Incidentally we were giving an absolute monopoly of the sealskin trade in this country to the North American Commercial Company, which leases the Pribyloff Islands and is entitled to bring in its skins as before. Thus is our moral position made strong. Thus is a customs law again made to wring the soul of the foreigner and to cause the native to pay more for his clothes.

After weeks of hard labor, the Navy Board, headed by the Assistant Secretary, has finished its bill for the reorganization of the service, and transmitted it to Secretary Long, accompanied by a very long explanatory report, written by Mr. Roosevelt. As was expected, the bill provides for the union of the line and the engineers, promotion by selection, increased pay for the officers, and a retired list for the enlisted men, and is therefore the most radical measure ever prepared in regard to our navy or any other navy. It requires not only that each graduate of Annapolis shall be an infantry drill-master, a hydrographer, an electrician, a navigator, a naval tactician and strategist, and an ordnance expert, acquainted with the handling and making of guns, powders, torpedoes, armor, and projectiles, but that he shall also be fully able to care for and direct the intricate machinery of every kind to be found on board a man-of-war. Whether, in these days of necessary specialization, one officer can become expert in all these scientific matters, is a question that can be decided only after the system has been put in effect, for in no other service of to-day has it been thought of. Indeed, the only analogies that Mr. Roosevelt can draw are from the times of the Spanish Armada, of Blake, and of Nelson. It is well that the bill provides also for a body of warrant machinists, who will not be called upon to do "deck" duty, and upon whom the responsibility of the engine-room will mainly rest, as it does upon the engineers of to-day.

The proposal to regulate promotion by selection—that is, by having a certain number of the least able officers forcibly retired each year in order to promote their subordinates—is open to two very serious objections. The danger that these retirements will be largely affected by political and social influence Mr. Roosevelt himself recognizes, but seeks to minimize by having the weeding out done by officers of the highest rank. It is unfortunately true, however, that some of the most persistent seekers after and wielders of political influence in Washington, of late years, have been captains, commodores, and admirals, and they will probably continue to be, unless human nature changes or most stringent regulations are enforced. Furthermore, the voluntary or forced retirement each year of a number of able-bodied and—if the general standard is high—mentally qualified officers will add to the retired list fifteen or more members each year. If these men are employed on shore duty, it will be tantamount to an increase of the active navy; if unemployed, the Government will find itself with a new class of able-bodied pensioners, quite capable of earning large salaries, on its hands. Mr. Roosevelt lays stress upon the fact that the proposed increase will augment the pay of the navy "only" $600,000. That will be true this year, but not in 1899, and still less as the years go on and the retired lists of officers and men steadily grow, for the present one has largely increased from year to year during the last decade. That 180 more officers have been asked for is no surprise. Fifteen years ago the cry was, We must have new ships, and plenty of them, to keep our officers busy. Now, having built more ships than are needed by so fortunately situated and peaceably disposed a nation as ours, we must have more expensive officers. It is only a couple of years since the number of enlisted men was increased, and now there are calls for more of them, and will continue to be as long as there is any chance of aping European countries and heaping greater and greater burdens upon our own.

The factional opposition to Hanna in Ohio has proved to be more widespread and persistent than was anticipated, and the Foraker wing has detached from the machine enough members to carry its point if it can hold its men. At this writing it has won the first skirmish at Columbus by securing the organization of the Legislature, but the real fight over the senatorship is still to be fought. The opposition have the advantage temporarily, by reason of controlling the patronage of the Legislature, but they are suffering from the lack of popular support. They are repudiating all the obligations of partisanship, and yet they are unable to show that there is any patriotism or principle in their course. In this situation the champions of regularity are supported by public opinion, and it remains to be seen whether the bolters can stand out against the popular demands that they shall abide by the action of the party organization. The Republican opponents of Hanna are also embarrassed by the difficulty of making terms about the senatorship with the Democratic members of the Legislature, who are inclined to drive a hard bargain. As the voting for Senator will not begin for a week, and may drag on for a good while, the country is going to have a thorough exhibition of Ohio factional politics at its worst.

The method of selection which has been followed in regard to the men who are to operate the machinery of Greater New York is a totally new thing in the history of civilized government. Mr. Croker has been engaged for two months, mainly at Lakewood, New Jersey, in the task of choosing these men. Who have been his advisers in this great task? Has he taken counsel with our leading authorities on municipal government, our most eminent financiers, our successful merchants, our chief lawyers and professional men? Have any of these been to Lakewood and had audience at the Croker court? Not one of them has been seen there. If any of them had gone, he would have been given short shrift by the Boss, who has made it known to the world that he has no use for the advice of such citizens. Not only has he spurned the counsel of men of success in all walks and professions of private life, but he has confined his selection of men for office under the new government to persons who either have no private business, or so little of it that they are willing to abandon it on becoming public servants. This is right under the Boss system. Any other plan would have been absurd. Hugh J. Grant promised us in 1888, that he would make his appointments from the "highest order of citizenship that the county affords." The present Tammany boss has "moved farther into the wilderness" since he was restored to power. He openly spurns the highest order of citizenship and constructs his government from the lowest. The results of his policy will furnish material for thought to the students of government throughout the world.

It should be said of the new Police Board that we have never had a more complete embodiment of the bi-partisan idea than it presents. It is headed by Barney York of the Borough of Brooklyn, who is on it as "Boss McLaughlin's man." Its Treasurer is Tom Hamilton of the Borough of Manhattan, who is on it primarily as "Gibbs's man," but fundamentally as Platt's man, the information that he was Platt's selection for the place having convinced Croker that he was the man for it. He represents on the board the first instalment of the debt which Croker owes to Platt for the gift of the government of the city. The next man on the board is Johnny Sexton of the Borough of Manhattan, a Tammany district leader who is known as "Hugh J. Grant's man." The fourth and last member is Billy Phillips of the Borough of Brooklyn, who is known as "Willis's man," Willis being one of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican deputy leaders in Brooklyn who helped Platt "turn down" the Hon. Jacob Worth for his atrocious conduct in supporting Seth Low in preference to Tammany. It will be seen that every member of the board is on it as the representative of an expert in machine politics. We venture to say that there will be no "bickerings" or wrangling in this board. It will run as smoothly as in the days when Jimmy Martin and Sheehan represented Tammany on one side and Mike Kerwin and Charlie Murray represented Platt on the other. Genuine bi-partisan boards never quarrel; they "divvy." Each side is awarded its share of the good things agoing, and there is no provocation for squabbling.

Objection has been made to our recent statement that the plan of Cuban autonomy gives less than the Canadian measure of home rule. It is said that the Governor-General of Canada appoints all the members of the Dominion Senate and names all the judges. Yes, but the Canadian House has the absolute power of the purse; the Senate can neither initiate nor amend a money bill. The proposed "Council of Administration" in Cuba has, on the other hand, powers concurrent with those of the House of Representatives. Moreover, in Canada the Governor-General makes his nominations, and performs all executive acts, by and with the advice and consent of the Council of Ministers. But who are these ministers? They are the leaders of the party having a majority in the lower house of Parliament. Without that majority they cannot remain in office a day. Sir Wilfrid Laurier became Prime Minister by carrying a majority of the seats in the Dominion House. As soon as he loses that majority, out he goes, and all his ministers with him. As it is really the Canadian Ministry, and not the Governor-General, in whom the executive power is lodged, and as the Ministry is a creation of the popular Chamber, it is really in the latter that all power, subject to English sovereignty, resides. It would be easy to show, if it were worth while seriously to discuss the proposed Cuban autonomy any longer, that it comes far short, even in theory, of granting any such degree of home rule.

French and English relations were as much strained in negotiations about Madagascar, it appears from a recent parliamentary paper, as in disputes about rights on the headwaters of the Nile. When the French protectorate over Madagascar was established, existing British treaty and trading rights were recognized. But little by little the pressure of French protectionism led to the attempted introduction in the island of the French customs tariff, to the detriment of British trade. When Lord Salisbury protested against this step, Prime Minister Hanotaux responded with the *coup* of annexing Madagascar outright, making it therefore French territory and subject, accordingly, in all respects to French law. But Salisbury still protested; France had obtained her position in Madagascar on the strength of certain assurances to England; now she could not go ahead to annul by annexation the stipulations which alone had made annexation possible. He proposed, however, to surrender all English claims in Madagascar provided all similar French claims in Zanzibar were withdrawn; and this compromise appears to have been accepted and to have ended the controversy. The whole illustrates the ticklish international questions which are apt to grow out of annexation of distant territory.

The Chinese are said to be not at all comforted by the assurances offered them that the occupation of Kiao-Chau and Port Arthur is to be only "temporary." This is not strange. There is a French proverb which says that "nothing is more durable than the provisional," and the Mandarins have doubtless heard of this, or have something equivalent in their own language. Nor can they be much reassured by recalling the facts about some recent "temporary" occupations of foreign territory. England's stay in Egypt was to be brief. As soon as order was restored and the finances consolidated, the red-coats would be seen no more in Cairo. But now they are on the march to Khartum, with palpable intent to stay. So of the Anglo-Indian expedition to Chitral. The English garrison was to be rescued, the tribesmen punished, and then withdrawal was to follow. But now all the fighting beyond the frontier is for the purpose of permanently annexing the territory. So of the French in Madagascar, the Russians in Persia and Corea. No wonder the Chinese officials are a little dubious about the entirely friendly and purely temporary seizures of their bays and ports.

The declaration, announced in the Manchester *Guardian* on Monday, that Great Britain will use the most-favored-nation clause in her treaties, to see that she gets from China whatever any other Power gets in the way of privileges, naval stations, mines, or monopolies of any description, makes the situation look considerably clearer. This declaration does not cover cessions of territory, but it contains an obscure hint that, if territory is ceded, there may be trouble. The reason why the grand expedition of Brother Henry has been sent out is plain enough in view of the condition of the German trade with China. This has been falling off steadily during the last year. It appears from the English *Financial News* that German exportations to China rose to $9,500,000, and German exports to Japan to $7,250,000, during the years 1895-6, as against $74,000,000 British. But during the last seven months of 1897 the seven principal articles of German exportation to China have fallen off in weight 49 per cent. Those to Japan have fallen off 46 per cent. in weight. The *News* has taken these figures from the Imperial returns, and what they mean we do not pretend to know, but the Consecrated Person evidently believes he can apply a remedy. The only efficient remedy would be to compel the Chinese to take their custom away from the British and make their purchases of Germans, but this can hardly be done. There is thus some reason to fear that after Prince Henry gets on the ground, he may find his rôle reduced to great insignificance. Lord Salisbury will now probably have to act very energetically, for though the British business man may be willing to let him dawdle and be timid when he is acting on behalf of Greeks or Armenians, we may be sure there will be no indulgence when British trade is at stake. The British naval force in the Eastern seas is so much greater than that of any other Power, especially if supported by Japan, that a determined man at the Foreign Office can really do what he pleases in those regions.

Some seventy German editors are now in jail for *lèse-majesté*, and they will be welcoming more of their comrades as soon as the Emperor gets time to read the "press clippings" on the royal speeches at Kiel. The German newspapers are loyal, and they are cautious, but "the gospel of your Majesty's hallowed person" was too much for them. Some of the other exuberances and mediævalisms of the speeches are to be accounted for by the high-flown official dialect, which in German is something as different from English as English is from Chinese. But that "gospel"! "Only one Gospel is preached to us Christians," said the Conservative *Kreuz-Zeitung*. The Agrarian organ observes that "it is not permissible to speak of the royal person as 'hallowed.'" "There is only one hallowed person on earth—the Pope," declared the Catholic *Germania*. The loyal *Tageblatt* gave up the offensive phrase as one "which for the present is beyond our humble powers of comprehension"; while the Socialist *Vorwärts* sardonically invited the Cardinals and Archbishops to enlighten the public about the new gospel. One paper even ventures to challenge William's historical knowledge, and to deny that the Hanseatic League decayed, as he alleged, for "lack of imperial protection." This is rank blasphemy, and the only proper answer to it is a good term of imprisonment. There is nothing like solitary confinement on a bread-and-water diet to inculcate proper ideas about hallowed Majesty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOSSOCRACY.

Very few people seem to have fully understood the importance of the event of last Saturday—the transfer of the government of this city to Tammany Hall. Many intelligent people, some of them, we regret to say, lawyers, imagine that nothing more happened than the commencement of a term of four years of a régime likely to prove very corrupt, which the indignation of the citizens was sure to overthrow at the end of that time. What was really witnessed was one of the most interesting events in human history, the establishment not only of a new government, but of a new form of government, much more novel in many respects than the government of the United States was in 1789. Some imagine that it was the creation of a Cæsarism, but they forget that no Cæsarism has ever been set up except by the use of force, and that all Cæsars have been either successful soldiers or masters of a great army. In the present case all the forms of existing laws have been observed, and the person who seems to play the part of a Cæsar has never been a soldier, has never followed any higher calling than that of a blacksmith, has fought in the pugilistic ring, has been tried for murder, and is quite illiterate. Many people, too, imagine that the change means simply the transfer of the offices to a new set of men of the same kind as those who usually hold offices in cities—that is, to men who have won some repute in other callings and have some business experience; that, in short, Cromwell has taken the officers who served under Charles I. and Louis Napoleon those who served under Louis Philippe, and that there will be no real change in the city administration. The fact is that an entirely new kind of men has been introduced into public life, for the first time, we think, in human history—men who have never won any repute in any calling, who have never followed any honest calling, who have no experience or character, and who have obtained their appointments on an absolutely new system.

In all civilized countries, even in China, the appointing power at least makes a pretence that he has selected his appointees for fitness. Under this new régime, which is called "Bossocracy," he makes no such pretence at all. Offices are filled just as peers are created. The Boss is the fountain of offices, just as the King of England is "the fountain of honor." Men get them just as they get a dukedom or the Order of the Garter, not because they deserve them, but because the Boss likes them. An office in New York to-day is bestowed entirely without regard to merit, just as Lord Melbourne said the Order of the Garter was bestowed, because there was "no d——d merit in it." This is the greatest novelty of all—the holding in a civilized state of a large number of offices by men who make no pretence to being fit for them, as functions, or of having ever deserved them, as honors. The same power which made this peculiar arrangement might clearly go one step further, and make unfitness meritorious, reward a man openly for being drunk, idle, and ignorant, a soldier for running away in battle, a cashier for embezzling funds, or a policeman for robbing a house.

Singularly enough, too, the establishment of this new government has not, like all other new governments, been preceded by either discussion or defence. No one has recommended it or apologized for it. It is not described or explained in any of our schools and colleges. Go into any one of them to-day, and you will find all lectures on government devoted to a form of government which has not existed in this State or city for some years, and the disappearance of which apparently few people regret, while the new one is passed over in total silence. Yet it is the most interesting government ever set up. Montesquieu divides governments into three classes, and his classification has stood for one hundred and fifty years—the republican, the monarchical, and the despotic. He gives as the "principle" of both democracy and aristocracy "virtue," as the principle of monarchy "honor" as the principle of despotism "fear." Well, this new government of ours, having come into existence comparatively recently, of course is not mentioned by him, but its principle is not that of any of the three governments of which he speaks. The principle of Bossocracy is the "stuff," as it is called, and means simply the hope of those who live under it to make something, however small, out of it and by any means, even if ordinarily considered discreditable. Neither virtue nor honor nor fear finds any place in it. It is thus, as is easily seen, organized on a new basis, and deserves the attention of publicists. What we need from some competent hand is a candid examination of the "stuff" as a new political force, the limits of its action, and its influence on national character.

Another very curious feature about Bossocracy is that, although it apparently wants nearly every one of the old marks of good government described by the text-writers, it has been accepted by this great city more peaceably than any other new government ever set up. No existing monarchy or republic has made good its position without prolonged discussion, angry protests, and often bloody conflicts. But Bossocracy has taken its place without any opposition worthy of the name, and on a simple demand for the places. When the Democrats first began to frame it, the Republicans looked on with interested curiosity; then proceeded to imitate them, and, after a few years, joined them in setting it up. This makes it seem as if it supplied a long-felt want, and as if its suitability to the times was so plain that recommendation was unnecessary. The general result is that the belief is spreading that human experience has made a great mistake as to the conditions of successful administration and as to the objects of government. We are entering evidently on another great experiment. We are apparently about to try whether we need honor, or honesty, or knowledge, or character, for the conduct of human affairs; whether rascality and ignorance would not do just as well, besides coming far cheaper; and whether the object for which governments are set up is not chiefly to enable the knaves to enjoy themselves. If this be true, of course it will cause the greatest remodelling of moral systems ever seen since civilization began. The Republican theory that dearness is a benefit to the poor man, full of mental perturbation as it is, would be nothing to the theory that thieves were public benefactors, that lying was the best of social bonds, and that tyranny was the best form of government.

REPORT OF THE MONETARY COMMISSION.

The aim of the Indianapolis convention of last year, to inaugurate "a consistent, straightforward, deliberately planned monetary system," has been carried out in the most admirable manner by the commission appointed to do the work. It would be rash to assume that the plan reported by the commission will be adopted at once by Congress. It would be improper to claim perfection for it in all details—no such claim is made by the members themselves. Yet the main object has been accomplished of giving to the friends and advocates of currency reform a definite scheme to unite upon and work for, instead of scattering their forces on various plans or wasting their strength as heretofore on mere generalities. The commission has given us a plan that can be easily understood and readily put in the form of a bill for the consideration of Congress. It has also put, in clear and forcible terms, the reasons why such a bill should be passed, and why the existing haphazard condition of the currency is fraught with dangers too grave to be longer borne.

This report is not exposed to attack on the ground that it is the work of bankers or of doctrinaires. The latter phrase is usually applied to persons who have risen to the position of instructors in universities and colleges. Only one such person was a member of the commission, and he was chosen to fill a vacancy. No national banker was on the commission. The membership was composed almost wholly of representative

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business men of the country. They are the same kind of men as their constituent body, the Indianapolis convention, and these were the same kind of men as their constituent bodies, the commercial organizations of the United States. We have absolute assurance, therefore, that there is no politics in this report, no class interest, no deception, no design to favor bankers at the expense of other people, but that we have the plain truth as it is given to eleven men of intelligence, drawn from the ordinary walks of life, not appointed by political influence, and not paid for their services, to understand it. We put some stress upon these facts because so much lung power has been wasted in senseless objurgation against the national banks. Here is a document of the weightiest character relating to the currency question which no such banker has had any share in preparing. If it is to be attacked, it must be on other grounds than that of special and exclusive interest on the part of the men composing the commission. Something might be said of the high personal character and established reputation of the men composing the commission, but that would be superfluous.

The report begins with an enumeration and description of our ten different kinds of currency and the amounts of each in existence. It then takes up the subject of the standard of value to which all these things must be kept equal. Existing laws require that everything shall be kept equal to gold. Nevertheless, a considerable part of the voters in the last election supported a policy looking to a change in the present system and to a degradation of the standard. The reasons why the gold standard should be preserved and fortified are stated with clearness and without passion. The measures suggested to this end are (1) an explicit definition of the gold standard and a pledge that it shall be maintained; (2) a requirement that all obligations when not otherwise stipulated in the contract shall be payable in conformity with that standard; (3) the gradual retirement of the outstanding note issues of the Government.

To accomplish the third end it is proposed first to separate the banking functions of the Treasury from its other functions. The suggestion of Secretary Gage, that a Division of Issue and Redemption be established to which shall be transferred the gold reserve and all other assets and things belonging to the currency branch of the Government, is endorsed and made a part of the commission's plan. There are some differences of detail which we need not dwell upon now. The commission also endorses President McKinley's recommendation that Government notes once redeemed shall not be paid out again except in exchange for gold. It is recommended, also, that $50,000,000 of greenbacks and Treasury notes be retired and cancelled when presented for redemption, and that thereafter the retirement of said notes shall not exceed in amount the volume of new banknotes issued. The existing silver certificates are not to be disturbed. They are to be redeemed in silver dollars according to the terms of their issue, but silver dollars are to be exchangeable for gold at the Treasury at the request of any holder. No banknotes of less denomination than $10 are to be issued, so that eventually the field of circulation for small currency will be given wholly to silver and silver certificates. It is believed that under such circumstances there will be a constant demand for all of this kind of money outstanding in retail trade, so that none of the silver dollars will be presented for redemption. If presented, however, the obligations of both law and morality require that they be redeemed in gold, and it is essential that they should be so redeemed.

The last part of the report, which relates to changes in the banking system, is, perhaps, the one which will engage the greatest interest. It proposes to abolish gradually the present requirement of bond security for the issue of banknotes, and to substitute therefor note issues, based upon the general assets of the banks, which must not exceed the paid-up and unimpaired capital of the banks, and upon a common guarantee fund to be contributed in the form of a tax by all the banks. This guarantee fund must equal 5 per cent. of the notes outstanding, and, whenever reduced below that sum, must be replenished by an assessment on all the banks in proportion to the notes outstanding. Noteholders have the first lien on the assets of failed banks, and also on the liability of shareholders. The Government is not liable for note issues beyond the application of the guarantee fund and the assets to the purpose intended, but all the banks in the national system are responsible. This plan of note issues shall not take effect fully until the end of five years, prior to which time the note-issuing banks must have 25 per cent. of their capital stock invested in U. S. bonds and deposited in the Treasury. This is the Baltimore plan, with some variations, which we shall discuss hereafter.

The plan, as a whole, is worthy of the highest commendation, and the thanks of the business community are due to the members of the commission for the industry, intelligence, patience, and courage with which they have performed their duty.

ALLEN VS. FLOOD.

The case of Allen vs. Flood, decided in the English court of last resort on the 14th of December, is perhaps the most important English judgment rendered since the *Mogul* steamship case. Besides involving questions of the highest moment affecting liberty of contract and speech, it possesses great professional interest for lawyers, as having led to an authoritative exposition, by the ablest judges in England, of the nature and foundation of civil liability according to the system of law under which, not merely all English-speaking nations, but the whole civilized world lives.

The facts were not complicated, and may be stated in a few words. Flood and Taylor were two shipwrights doing "wood" work on a ship in the employment of the Glengall Company. They were engaged only by the day, and were liable to dismissal at any moment. There was a strong feeling against these men among the iron-workers employed by the company, arising out of the circumstance that the two "wood" men had previously done work in iron for another firm. The iron-workers, accordingly, called in Allen, a delegate or official of the Boilermakers' Union. Allen saw Halkett, the managing director of the company, informed him that there was danger of a strike, or that the iron-workers would be "called out" if they had to go on working with Flood and Taylor, and the two men were thereupon dismissed. They immediately sued, not their employer (because the latter acted entirely within his rights in discharging them), but the delegate Allen, and the question which has now occupied the courts for three years has been, Could damages be recovered against Allen because he procured their discharge? In the trial court the delegate was held liable, and the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision. When the appeal came before the Lords, however, it was found to be a case of such difficulty that they directed it be reheard by the judges who were called upon to advise the House of Lords as to the law. Six of the judges were in favor of dismissing the appeal, two only in favor of its allowance. But now, after taking the judges' opinion, the House of Lords has overruled it, and has allowed the appeal by the majority of six to three. It is said that no English precedent exists in which such a preponderance of judicial opinion and decision has been finally overruled. Ten judges and three Law Lords have been overruled by two judges and six Law Lords. It must be said, on the other side, that among the minority are numbered the greatest judges in England, and we doubt if any impartial American lawyer can read the opinions without coming to the conclusion that in the end the case was rightly decided.

The question which really caused most trouble in the case may be stated thus: A, for objects of his own, persuades B to discharge C, as B has a right to do. Can C sue A, and if he shows that some improper (*i. e.*, selfish) motive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operated on A's mind, recover damages? This and all the questions presented were fully disposed of by Lord Herschell's judgment, and his exposition of the law is so luminous that we cannot do better than follow it. It should be said in advance that the trial judge, Mr. Justice Kennedy, held that no case of conspiracy, coercion, or intimidation had been made out, but left two questions to the jury: (1.) Did Allen maliciously induce the company to discharge the plaintiff? (2.) Did Allen maliciously induce the company not to engage the plaintiff? Both these questions were answered in favor of the plaintiff, and damages were awarded. The question on which the Judges were asked to advise was: "Assuming the evidence given by the plaintiff's witnesses to be correct, was there any evidence of a cause of action fit to be left to the jury?"

Lord Herschell, after stating the facts, said that the question before the court was whether the findings of the jury entitled the plaintiff to a judgment. This question, he said, must be answered in the negative (because the defendant had done nothing unlawful) unless the finding that his behavior was "malicious" made him liable. This made it essential to determine what "malice" meant, because there could be no greater danger to a community than that a jury should be "at liberty to impose the penalty of paying damages for acts which are otherwise lawful because they choose" to call them malicious. He then showed that the judges who took the opposite view from him, in attempting to define malice, had got no further than making it equivalent to some sort of bad motive, or "such a disregard of his neighbor as no honest and fair-minded man ought to resort to." But this is no legal test, because it "makes men's responsibility for their actions depend on the fluctuating opinions of the tribunal before whom the case may chance to come, as to what a right-minded man ought or ought not to do in pursuing his own interests."

He then cites some cases in which it seems to have been suggested that legal malice includes persuasion where the object is to benefit the person who uses the persuasion at the expense of another, and points out that numberless instances may be put where such persuasion, "which is of constant occurrence in the affairs of life," is not considered even reprehensible. One of the commonest illustrations would be persuading a workman to strike, but Lord Herschell puts his whole reasoning in a nutshell, and enforces it by a homely illustration, easily understood by every one, man or master, employer or employed. Every one, he says, has a right to pursue his employment without molestation or obstruction, but this is only a deduction from a wider right to do what we please generally, and this wider liberty includes the right to say what we please (the right of free speech)—*i. e.*, to exhort, command, advise, and induce, provided we do not slander, or deceive, or commit any other legal wrong. Unless one is shown thus to have abused his right, he cannot be called upon to justify himself because his words may interfere with some one else in his calling. If the butler, says Lord Herschell, quarrels with the cook, and tells his master that they cannot remain under the same roof, and thus induces him to discharge the cook, must the butler pay the damages?

While finding the decision entirely in accord with the general drift of American authority, we should be inclined to suggest that in this class of cases another principle, which for some reason judges and counsel of great eminence often fail to notice, has an important bearing on the true conclusion. This is the principle that, as a rule, legal liability exists only when the efficient cause of the damage complained of is found in the defendant's act. When it is found in the voluntary act of a third person, the defendant is not liable, because he is not, in fact, as men look at such matters, responsible. In Allen vs. Flood the act which caused the damage was the act of the master and not of Allen. He had a perfect liberty of choice to discharge or not to discharge, and the discharge was consequently his individual act. But for this principle, legal responsibility, as we know it, would cease to exist, and a new system would be introduced, under which a man could not open his mouth, in any matter in which he had an interest, without running great risk of an action for damages. The Lord Chancellor, in his opinion, actually goes so far as to suggest that the lawfulness of what we say or do depends on there being no "indirect motive" present; the prevailing opinion is founded on what we believe to be the sound and ancient principle, that civil liability has no necessary connection with motive, but is closely and inevitably related to that notion of responsibility which we apply every day to one another, in our ordinary dealings and judgments.

TRUMPERY LIBEL SUITS.

A batch of newspaper libel suits was brought recently before the Lord Chief Justice and a special jury, in the Court of Queen's Bench, London, and disposed of in a manner quite different from that followed in our courts under similar conditions. The first case was that of a professional magician against a newspaper which had commented in a jocose manner upon a project which he had for making money out of the Queen's Jubilee. He had made an agreement with some property-owners in St. Paul's Churchyard, to take down their shops and erect his grand stand in their places, pledging himself to rebuild the shops free of cost after the celebration was over. In commenting upon this plan, the offending newspaper had spoken of the magician's grand stand as his latest Aladdin's palace, and intimated that the magician might be playing a trick, since he had "so often seriously deceived the public." The magician made formal complaint to the newspaper, through his solicitors, that the article was calculated to throw doubt upon his ability to carry out his project, and thus interfere with the sale of his grand-stand seats. The editor replied that his remarks were intended to be humorous, and he believed that that intent was sufficiently obvious to prevent pecuniary damage to the scheme.

When this case came before the Lord Chief Justice, and the offending paragraph was read to the court, his Lordship asked in some surprise: " 'Deceived the public'—is not that true? Surely that has been Mr. Maskelyne's [the magician's] business. I know he has often deceived me." There was general laughter in the court-room at this direct method of meeting the case; and his Lordship continued, asking the plaintiff's counsel: "Where is the libel? Is it any thing more than a chaffing article? Really, for a man of Mr. Maskelyne's reputation to think that this article involves any imputation upon his character seems to me ridiculous." In response to this, all the plaintiff's counsel could say was that he thought the article was calculated to injure the seat-selling prospects of his client, and that instead of being always engaged in the business of deceiving the public, his client had devoted himself repeatedly to the exposure of deceits foisted upon the people by others. When he had finished, the foreman of the jury said that he and his associates were of the opinion that there was no libel and did not think that the case should proceed. The case was thereupon dismissed, the defendant's counsel saying they were quite willing to declare that no imputation was intended in what was sincerely meant to be a joke.

After this, two other cases were presented against as many newspapers for the same offence. There was a misunderstood joke at the bottom of these complaints also. The Registrar of the Croydon County Court alleged that he had been held up to ridicule and damaged in the estimation of the community, because, in reporting an incident in his court, in which a bogus lord had been ejected from the room for using bad language, he was said to have "roared" at the offender. The newspaper accounts sought to make the incident ludicrous by picturing the bogus lord as waving his arms and belaboring with his umbrella the officer who ejected him, but the only reflection made upon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Registrar was in the assertion that he "roared, 'Turn that man out.'" When the Lord Chief Justice had the case fully before him he asked the plaintiff's counsel in visible surprise: "Is the whole thing that you complain of here that it stated that the Registrar roared? I do not know what these cases are coming to at all." When the counsel had endeavored to show that the charge was likely to bring the Registrar into disrepute by making him appear as having acted in an undignified manner, the truth being that he had not "roared" but had spoken quietly, his Lordship said: "There is no judge so low that he cannot afford to pass over matters of this kind. This gentleman, I see, is said to be a member of the bar. He ought to have better sense than to take notice of trash such as this."

In this case, as in the preceding, the jury volunteered the information that they had reached the conclusion that there was no libel, and the cause was dismissed, as was its fellow against the other newspaper. In disposing of the entire batch the Lord Chief Justice said:

"I cannot avoid making this observation. There is no more valuable remedy for the protection of the character of private and public persons than the law of libel, but there is no remedy so susceptible of abuse as that law, and I am very glad to see that juries are ready and able and firm enough to discriminate between trumpery cases and real cases—by trumpery cases I mean such as those we have been dealing with this morning. The courts are not intended for the ventilation of unreal and unsubstantial grievances, but for the vindication of character from real imputations, aspersions, and wrongs."

This view of the law of libel is especially pertinent in this city at the present time, for never in our history has the business of trumpery, or, as we know them, frivolous libel suits been prosecuted with such systematic persistence as at present. We have, in fact, a considerable body of lawyers who devote their energies entirely to it. They scour the newspapers for reflections of all kinds upon anybody and everybody, in the hope of making them the basis of suits for damages in libel. It makes no difference where the matter appears, whether in the news or in the editorial columns. When they find it, they go to the persons whom it concerns and tell them that there is a "house and lot," or a "small fortune," or some other alluring thing in it for them, and offer to bring the suit for a half share in the sum secured. This business has assumed enormous proportions in recent years, and it seems to have attracted envious attention in England. It is a great pity that our courts do not dispose of it as summarily as the Lord Chief Justice did. Our libel laws are far less stringent than the English laws are, but our court methods are quite different, so far as the part which the Judge takes in the proceedings before him is concerned. At the same time, our judges have full power to prevent frivolous cases from going to the jury, and they might exercise this much more frequently than they do.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION.

NEW YORK, December 30, 1897.

The fifteenth annual convention of the Modern Language Association, held December 27-29 at the University of Pennsylvania, passed off successfully, and will be remembered with pleasure by all who were in attendance. Philadelphians long ago set a high standard in the entertainment of scientific societies; there was reason to expect good things, both formal and informal, and this expectation was abundantly fulfilled. The address of the President, Prof. Albert S. Cook of Yale, though entitled "The Province of English Philology," was not an attempt to delimit English in contradistinction from other philologies (this would hardly be necessary), but rather a *pro domo* for philology in general. In an urbane and well-turned argument, which was full of quiet edification for those who heard it, Prof. Cook paid his respects to the defamers of philology from Seneca down to a certain living toreador, whom he did not call by name, and whom we shall therefore forbear to mention. The attack was made to appear a very old story, resting always upon the same sort of bad logic and narrow prejudice. The speaker did not say, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do; but he deftly laid bare the mental condition on which that famous petition is grounded. Some dull men had indeed taken to philology in every age of the world—because there was not room for all the dull men in the other professions. Prof. Cook closed with a plea for a broad interpretation of philology, as the science which aims to make the past relive "in its form and pressure" through the study of its surviving records. He deprecated, as many have done before, the identification of philology with linguistics, urging at the same time, as a fact proved by experience, that literary study cannot really thrive without careful attention to the matters of language. The spirit is the main thing, but the spirit is revealed only through the letter; wherefore the letter can never be unimportant.

In the course of four half-day sessions of the Association more than a score of papers were read. To single out any of them for comment in a brief report like this would be unfair, since the mere selection, to say nothing of the comments, would inevitably reflect the writer's private bias. Suffice it to say that the programme was of at least average scientific interest, several animated and profitable discussions having to be cut short for lack of time. Of the twenty-eight papers listed, a plurality had to do with the English language and literature; the Germanists being less in evidence this time than the Romance philologists. As its next President the Association elected Prof. Alcée Fortier of Louisiana, and it was agreed to hold the next meeting at the University of Virginia. It is also worth noting that action was taken looking toward a joint session with the Philological Association and the Oriental Society in 1899. Whether this initiative will lead to the end desired remains to be seen, but the cause is at any rate good. This was demonstrated at the memorable Whitney meeting three years ago.

A minor incident of the Philadelphia convention is of sufficient general interest to deserve mention by itself—namely, the report of progress submitted by the Committee of Twelve upon college entrance requirements in French and German. The appointment of this committee was ordered a year ago in response to a communication from the National Educational Association, which is endeavoring to bring about, for the country at large, a somewhat greater uniformity in preparatory standards and in modes of testing a candidate's fitness for college work. The Modern Language Association was invited to put itself on record, as counsellor of the Educational Association, with respect to the preparatory study of French and German; to agree upon and define certain grades of preparation, the meaning of which could be definitely understood by teachers everywhere, and which could then be prescribed by the colleges in their own way without any impairment of their existing prerogative. The matter was felt to be one of considerable educational importance, and was accordingly turned over to a large committee, with elastic orders to investigate and report. The committee has done a great deal of work during the past year, chiefly in the collection of facts, opinions, and suggestions pertaining to the teaching of French and German in the secondary schools of the United States. The collated returns from several hundred circulars were given to the full committee at Philadelphia, but as several important questions were evidently in need of further investigation, it was decided to appoint a number of sub-committees, report progress to the Association, and ask for further time. One of these sub-committees is charged with reporting recent contributions to the methodology of modern-language teaching; another will study the question of French and German in grades below the high school, while a third will draw up model courses of different lengths, and define the grade of attainment to be aimed at in each. It is expected that these committees will take their tasks somewhat seriously and present reports of scientific value. Another year must therefore elapse ere the general committee can be ready with its final report. Meanwhile, teachers and others interested in the committee's work can obtain a hearing for their views if they have any practical suggestions to offer. The chairman is Prof. Calvin Thomas, Columbia University, New York.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

NEW YORK, January 3, 1898.

The thirteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association, in Cleveland last week, was one of the most successful and important ever held. From a pedagogical standpoint the principal event of the session was the report of Prof. A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan, chairman of the Committee of Seven appointed a year ago to consider the study of history in schools. Although this report was by no means final, the general lines of investigation and solution of the problem seem to have been fairly established. The question early resolved itself into two, the determination of an ideal course of history in the schools, and the question of college entrance requirements in history. Of these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first absorbed the greater attention, owing to the greater divergence in the standards and facilities for history teaching in the schools. The extremely tentative general conclusions on which the committee agreed regarding this question were as follows. It was suggested that a course of four years of five hours a week should be the goal of teachers of history. It was further suggested that the first year be devoted to Greek and Roman history to the downfall of the Empire, studied not as entirely isolated subjects, but as related, together with some consideration of the history of the more ancient nations; the second year, to general European history from perhaps the fall of Rome to modern times, a period of equal weight and importance, though the question of the line of division between the first and second year's courses was left open for the present. It is possible the committee may recommend later some such arrangement as will include general European history to 800 or to the formation of the Holy Roman Empire in the first year's work. The third block or period includes English history, which, although in itself possibly undeserving of so much attention as its predecessors, may be given greater weight by dwelling upon its broader aspects of continental relations and imperial development, and be studied in part as an amplification of European history, with England as the central and illustrative figure. The fourth year, it was agreed, should be devoted to American history, with special reference to the preceding work, having civil government as a collateral study, and regarding present conditions, institutions, government, and law in the light of evolution.

As to methods, it was suggested that a narrative text-book should be used, aided by collateral reading largely in secondary material, written work, reviews, and recitations, topical work, maps; and, as far as possible, sources should be used by the teacher for illustration, to add reality and concreteness to the instruction. In its final printed report the committee hopes to indicate what sources it considers suitable, and in other respects to be as helpful and suggestive as possible. The question of training in history in grades below the high school was postponed until further light could be shed upon that subject by an examination of the present status of history teaching in the schools in this country and abroad. The committee's report was approved by the Association, and the committee continued.

The paper of Superintendent Nightingale of the Chicago public schools on the same subject followed almost exactly the same lines and reached practically the same conclusions as that of the Committee of Seven, which, by the way, will meet again next April in Ann Arbor. The discussion as to the extent to which sources may profitably be used in the teaching of history below the Graduate School was led by Prof. A. B. Hart of Harvard, E. P. Cheyney of Pennsylvania, and J. A. Woodburn of Indiana, and was extremely animated. The general weight of opinion inclined on the whole towards a judicious use of sources and so-called "source books" by the teacher, and to some extent by the student, whenever practicable, as a vivifying adjunct to text-book, lecture, and class-room work, and this view was borne out later in the discussion on the report of the Committee of Seven.

Among the most pleasant and profitable features of the meeting were the two joint sessions with the American Economic Association. The first of these was occupied with a discussion on the opportunities for American students of history and economics in Europe, led by Prof. C. H. Haskins of Wisconsin, who read an exhaustive and interesting paper on "Historical Studies in Paris," and by Prof. H. Morse Stephens of Cornell, who spoke on facilities for American students at Oxford. The opinion of each of these speakers and of those who followed was that, more and more, American students must realize that the chief good of study abroad is not to the beginner, but to him who has already obtained his training, method, and information here. The second joint session was taken up with a paper by Prof. A. T. Hadley of Yale on "Rate-Making and Taxation: Their Resemblance and Difference," attended by discussion, and with an extremely interesting debate on the relation of the teaching of economic history to the teaching of political economy, led by Prof. H. B. Gardner of Brown, H. R. Seager of Pennsylvania, and G. W. Knight of Ohio State University. Of the various papers read before the Association, probably those of most general interest were the admirable study of the teaching of history in German Gymnasia by Prof. Lucy M. Salmon of Vassar, and the estimation of State historical societies by R. G. Thwaites of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and Prof. J. Franklin Jameson of Brown.

By far the most important question on the administrative side which came up for consideration was that of the identification of the *American Historical Review* with the American Historical Association. Certain plans were discussed and certain steps taken to this end, and the result will appear at some further meeting. In the way of other business the Association was shown to be on a sound and satisfactory financial basis by the report of the Treasurer, Dr. C. W. Bowen of New York. The next meeting will be held in New Haven, December 27, 28, and 29, 1898; and it is greatly to be hoped, for both social and financial reasons, that the Economic Association may, as this year, convene at the same place at the same time. The officers of the Historical Association for the ensuing year are: President, Prof. George P. Fisher of Yale; First Vice-President, James F. Rhodes; Second Vice-President, Edward Eggleston. The other officers are continued with a few changes. Ex-President James Schouler is added to the Executive Council, ex-officio; Prof. George B. Adams and President E. M. Gallaudet retire from the Council, and Chief Justice Fuller and Prof. A. B. Hart were chosen to fill the places thus left vacant. The report of the Manuscripts Committee of the Association by Prof. J. Franklin Jameson consisted mainly of an announcement of the forthcoming volume of the Association report. This will include five valuable sources for American history, the letters of Phineas Bond, English agent in Philadelphia, 1787-1789; a monograph on Canadian history; a collection of letters of the High Federalist, Stephen Higginson; the diary of Edward Hooker about 1805; and Prof. F. J. Turner's valuable collection of correspondence of the intrigues between Genet and George Rogers Clarke regarding the contemplated expedition to attack New Orleans. To these, among other material, will be added a bibliographical descriptive list of archives. Succeeding volumes, it is expected, will contain among other things a bibliography of Colonial and State Legislatures to 1800, and accounts of material in the various State archives.

No report of the meeting of the Historical Association which omitted all notice of the social side of its activities could pretend to completeness. The various receptions by hospitable Cleveland citizens and clubs, the great luncheon of the combined Economic and Historical Associations, together with the luncheon given them by the Western Reserve University at Adelbert College, and the usual Historical Association reunion, added much to the pleasure of the meeting.

THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

NEW YORK, January 3, 1898.

The American Psychological Association met in Christmas week at Ithaca with the American Naturalists and Affiliated Societies, which included this year for the first time the newly formed Botanical Society and Section H of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Anthropology). It will probably have a regular winter meeting hereafter with these societies. The Psychological Association commanded a good attendance, and the same is true of most of the other societies—the physiologists and anthropologists being exceptions.

The programme of the Psychologists was full and interesting, and for the first time it extended over part of the third day. The first day was devoted largely to experimental papers and reports. Much research work already done and awaiting publication was reported from the laboratories at Columbia, Yale, and Princeton, by their respective directors, Cattell, Scripture, and Baldwin, with interesting details of new apparatus. In the afternoon the abundance of material required the operation of two sections, one of which was occupied with a further report of the committee on mental tests, which, it may be remembered, made a preliminary report last year. Prof. Jastrow of Wisconsin, a member of the committee, gave the main paper on the subject, laying down what he considered the requisites of a scheme of tests which could be made generally available in colleges and normal and high schools. Following him, Prof. Cattell analyzed last year's report with a view to indicating the amount of agreement which existed in regard to the tests proposed; and Prof. Baldwin reported further researches carried on in his laboratory on the methods of investigating and testing memory. On the whole, the afternoon's discussion brought out many interesting aspects of the matter of physical and mental tests. The interest in it may be judged from the facts that the committee was continued, and the Association appropriated $100 to aid the committee in carrying on its investigations. This appropriation is the first in the history of the Association, and indicates both its flourishing financial condition, and the beginning of a policy of lending its aid and encouragement to scientific projects which seem to be for the general good.

The morning of Wednesday was devoted to the address of the President, Prof. Baldwin, and a well-planned discussion on the psychology and anthropology of Invention.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President's address was on "Selective Thinking," which he defines as "the determination of the stream of thought." His general point of view may be described as a continuation into the sphere of selective thought of the principles of motor accommodation and organic selection worked out in his recent book on 'Mental Development.' The address, which appears in the January issue of the *Psychological Review*, was distributed the day before, and so came into the discussion on Invention. The discussion proper was opened by Prof. Royce of Harvard with an elaborate paper. He first laid out the topic, indicating its main problems and bearings, and then reported some interesting experiments carried out by him to determine the actual working of the mind in the invention of new varieties of simple hand-drawn figures. This is the first attempt to bring the inventive processes to the test of experiment, and it was generally acknowledged that the speaker made a distinct "lead" which psychologists could take up with profit. The second speaker was Prof. Jastrow, who emphasized the phenomena of variation, and gave hints toward the statistical treatment of the facts of invention. Dr. W. M. Urban of Princeton followed with a special examination of the "Utility-Selection Theory of Mental Development," devoting attention to the recent theory of Dr. Simmel of Berlin and to the President's address. In the general discussion which followed, the anthropological side of invention was well presented by Dr. F. Boas of Columbia and Dr. Magee of the Bureau of Ethnology at Washington. Abstracts of the discussion may be found in the Proceedings, to be published in the March number of the *Psychological Review*, and the principal papers will appear in full in that or a later issue of the same journal.

On Wednesday afternoon the Psychologists met with the Affiliated Societies to hear the discussion of the Naturalists on the "Biological Problems of To-day," in which each of the subjects Palæontology, Botany, Anatomy, Psychology, Physiology, Developmental Mechanics, Morphogenesis, had its main problems stated by an expert, from the platform of the most recent advances. The general result was good, despite the very uneven character of the addresses. They varied from the admirable résumés by Morgan and Davenport to the inadequate report by Prof. Wilder of Cornell, who represented the problems of anatomy by presenting his own views of the morphogenesis of the olfactory lobe! Psychology was represented by Prof. Cattell, who hardly took the occasion seriously enough.

On the third day the time—only the forenoon—was given to more philosophical papers which do not lend themselves to brief reporting. The social features were pleasant, including a reception to all the societies, tendered by President Schurman. As to reception and entertainment, the University authorities made admirable arrangements, and much gratitude was felt to the local committee, officered by Profs. Gage and Rowlee. The next meeting of the Psychologists is to be with the Naturalists, probably in New York, barring the possibility of a one-day session in Boston in connection with the American Association next summer. The newly elected officers of the Psychological Association are: President, Prof. Hugo Münsterberg of Harvard; Councillors, Profs. Creighton of Cornell and Delabarre of Brown, and Dr. Kirschmann of Toronto.

Correspondence.

THE SPECIE CIRCULAR.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am certainly grateful, as I doubt not others will be, to Mr. Catterall for his communication, in No. 1696 of the *Nation*, in regard to the "alleged specie circular of 1827." I beg to say, however, in reply to Mr. Catterall's remark that if I "had looked a little further," I should "have found that the instructions of Rush did not stand alone, but were supported by like instructions, both before and after Rush's incumbency of the Treasury," that I did "look a little further," and had before me the various circulars from which he quotes, and the speeches of Benton and others to which he refers; and that I did not introduce them because they did not appear indispensable to the elucidation of the small point to which my attention had been attracted, namely, the alleged "similarity" of the two circulars of 1827 and 1836. Now that Mr. Catterall has made such interesting and instructive use of this additional material, I am disposed to regret even less that I did not try to use it myself.

William MacDonald.

Bowdoin College, December 31, 1897.

PLATO SHELVED.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There has recently come into my hands an interesting specimen of modern academic eloquence. It is entitled "The Passing of Plato," and purports to be an address delivered at the sixth annual commencement of the Leland Stanford Junior University. The ingenuous youth of that institution of learning are herein given to know that, during the last hundred years, physical science has completely transformed the world and shown mankind that all previous history has been a mistake. This beneficent consummation might have been realized far sooner had not the development of the good genius of humanity been arrested at its birth in Greece some four hundred years before Christ. It was Socrates and Plato who stayed the progress of civilization by introducing the vain distinction between mind and body, and accustoming mankind to the pernicious exercise of "pure thought." To Platonism, the incarnate antithesis of the scientific spirit, is chiefly due the long night of the Middle Ages, broken by a few stray gleams at the Renaissance, but completely dispelled only by the new dawn of physical science in the present century. *Pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis.* Ahriman still lingers in those "Plato-ridden institutions," our elementary and secondary schools. But he will soon be expelled from his last stronghold, and then happiness and science will dawn, though late, upon the earth. Then shall we abandon the idle distinction of mind and body: philosophy will "give up that solemn bluff"; the old education will no longer be defended by "mystic pictures of its fancied relation to an imaginary soul"; the graduate will discard the foolish millinery of caps and gowns, the undergraduate will study, not for a degree, but from pure love of science, and all will be well in the most scientific of all possible worlds and universities.

All this would be merely funny were it not that it is typical of a style of eloquence and a conception of human progress that threaten to be very potent in moulding opinions and shaping policies. There seems to be no tribunal of educated opinion of which our popular teachers stand in awe when they mount the platform. No peal of Homeric laughter greeted President Andrews's statement that Virgil is an indecent writer, that Plato is a Hobbist, and that John Stuart Mill owed nothing to the classics. And the scientific reputation of the author of this pamphlet will not suffer at all from the unscientific character of the philosophy of history which he has taken at second-hand from Lewes's 'Biographical History of Philosophy' and Lange's 'History of Materialism.' Of what avail is it to tell him and his readers that Plato advocated the endowment of mathematical research, demanded and predicted the application of mathematics to physics and astronomy, and insisted that all leaders of public opinion ought to be trained in the severest science of the age? What heed will they pay to the observation that the Middle Age was not so narrow because it studied Aristotle, but was unable to get beyond an imperfectly understood Aristotle because it was so narrow? How can he feel the absurdity of identifying progress with the "Passing of Plato" if he is not aware of the simple and verifiable fact that the influence of Plato on the world's best thought and literature during the last fifty years has been greater than at any time except the Renaissance and the age of Neo-Platonism?

The eloquence of this discourse is wasted on a dead issue. Science is anything but a Cinderella or a persecuted martyr at the American university. No humanist now attacks science or, except in casual controversial petulance, says a word in disparagement of "her." One might as well speak disrespectfully of the Equator or run a tilt against the law of gravitation. The question of the next twenty years is not whether physical science shall be cultivated at the university and continue to receive the lion's share of buildings and appropriations. It is, rather, Shall the humanities be cast out altogether as obsolete rubbish in order to secure what our writer calls "the cleanest action" of the educational system? When disheartened as to the issue of this controversy, I sometimes encourage myself with the reflection that the instinct of self-preservation in humanity will never tolerate, as the dominant or exclusive type of modern education, a discipline the final flower and outcome of which is such a rhetoric and such a philosophy of history as we find in this pamphlet.

Paul Shorey.

University of Chicago, December 29, 1897.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR BY WAY OF LATIN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: May I speak of "the time-problem" in preparation for college, in connection with the ordinary public schools?

In the spring of 1888 a book called a "Language-Book" was in use in our grammar-schools; employing a nomenclature in part

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

translated from the German. A noun was a *name-word;* an adjective, a *quality-word;* a verb, an *action-word;* an adverb, a *how, when,* or *where-word.* After one year and two terms spent on this book, a class took up an ordinary grammar, when this clumsy nomenclature, so needlessly sown in their hapless minds, had to be uprooted, and an unusually bright boy said he had not expected to find parsing so difficult. Much of his trouble undoubtedly came from finding himself obliged to call everything by a new name. Although the book is discarded, the case is still in point, for the boy is now halfway through Harvard College, and I can say definitely where some of his time was wasted. The moral is, that text-books require college supervision from the outset. When scholars arrive in the high school, it is already too late to think of saving time; the time is lost in the grammar school.

Why spend five years in studying English grammar to gain results confessed to be so unsatisfactory? One reason why they are so is, that the work is too advanced for the minds of the children, which would be more fitly employed in acquiring the jingle-jingle of the Latin inflections, leaving the parsing for a later day. When the time for that arrives, the principles of grammar are the same in all languages; while, owing to the lack of inflection in English, it is actually easier in Latin to see how the various parts of speech agree, and to grasp the relations of case.

When the boy of the Middle Ages sat down to study grammar in the monastery schools, he did not study English grammar or German grammar; he went directly to work on Latin. Why cannot the boy of the present day do the same? It would be killing two birds with one stone. He would get no less than he gets now of the English (which is evidently so much dead matter; he does not assimilate it and cannot use it), and he would be laying his Latin foundation instead of leaving that for the high school and an age when he will acquire it less easily, and will be fit for more advanced work. As it is, he has almost nothing to show for five years' work. If he began with Latin, he could not avoid having his inflections, while the age from eight to ten years is of all others the age for learning them—the age at which a jingle-jingle is so readily acquired and so indelibly retained. Five years is the age set for learning to read. Eight should be set for beginning Latin. I have heard complaints from children whose parents' anxiety had not allowed them to learn to read until the age of seven. The hard-pressed boy of the period might with equal reason complain, "Oh, why did you not give me Latin sooner?"

If he spent two years on the inflections, he would be using two years to advantage which are now all but wasted. He should not be expected to parse, as the graduate from the "Language-Book" was. He should learn only the inflections, and he should repeat them orally and write them on the board; for one child takes things in more easily at the ear, and another at the eye. Both should be considered, and the former has been too much disregarded of late with all the mischievous individual writing on paper, which isolates children instead of letting their minds rub one on other. It is the same with spelling. Oral spelling was long forbidden in our schools, which is one-sided, for the reason above mentioned. Such a fad, going hand in hand with the phonetic system of spelling (that stupendous failure), has produced a generation that cannot spell. Their letters, written in my young days, would have reflected great discredit on the individual; now they simply expose the system.

Educators have yet to learn the currents of that unknown sea, the child's mind. They might very well take a lesson from the great Nansen, the apostle of fitness, and, seeking out those currents, patiently float with them—not impatiently strain athwart them. The grouping of cases in the modern arrangement of the inflection of Latin nouns, for instance, is a snag which interrupts the flow without leaving any permanent trace, for it is a distinct, conscious effort of the mind, and the child will forget it when he would not forget the jingle of the cases in their natural sequence.

HELEN MANSFIELD.

GLOUCESTER, MASS., December 27, 1897.

Notes.

'The Sacrament in Song,' a collection of extracts from poems bearing on the Communion, fitted for a Christian daily year-book, with a preface by the Archbishop of York, will shortly be issued by Henry Frowde.

A Genealogy of the Sanborn Family, compiled by V. C. Sanborn of La Grange, Ill., is nearly ready for the printer. It will embrace a chapter, by Mr. Frank B. Sanborn of Concord, on the mode of life and general character of the New Hampshire people in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; together with numerous portraits of prominent bearers of the name, and other illustrations.

'Literary Statesmen and Others,' by Norman Hapgood (Chicago: Herbert S. Stone & Co.), is a collection of essays in literary criticism. The book has nothing to do with statesmanship, although there is some allusion to it in the essay on John Morley, and Lord Rosebery and Arthur Balfour are subjected to examination. But this examination relates only to their writings, and in the case of Lord Rosebery it is slight enough. Mr. Balfour is more carefully estimated, and Mr. Morley receives even more critical study. In fact, the essay on Morley is a very clever piece of criticism; discriminating, appreciative, and, on the whole, just. The papers on Stendhal, Mérimée, American Art Criticism, and American Cosmopolitanism, do not impress us; that on Henry James is more substantial. Mr. Hapgood possesses both critical insight and literary skill; but his criticism seems to us to lack unity and continuity. In dealing with particular aspects of style, however, it is often suggestive.

In a privately printed pamphlet, Mr. J. C. Schwab has told in great detail the 'Revolutionary History of Fort Number Eight.' Naturally the attention is concentrated on the military movement, and no attempt has been made to place the fort in its relations with the general plan of campaign, if, indeed, there could be such a plan when Washington could not tell where the next blow would be struck on his force, demoralized by the ill-advised Long Island occupation and subsequent retreat. Fort No. 8 was a redoubt hastily thrown up by the British on what is now the Schwab property to cover the attack on Fort Washington. It is to be feared that few will agree with the writer's military opinions. To speak of the British army as the best organized and "officered military body ever seen up to that time" is too favorable a judgment; while to "epitomize" Washington's skill as a general by his "ability to run away from the English troops and to escape being drawn into battle except under circumstances more favorable to their side," is too unfavorable to American generals. With a changing and untrained army, or often with only the shadow of an army, it required true generalship to keep any front to the enemy. A well-drawn map accompanies this praiseworthy essay in Revolutionary incident.

'Historic Letters,' from the Wayne and Persifer Smith collections in the State Normal School at Westchester, Pa., opens with a letter from Arnold to Wayne on this capture of Fort Washington, and closes with a letter from Jefferson Davis to General Smith. So long an interval covered in less than forty pages of large type implies that the letters are few in number; the material, however, is good, and well deserves preservation in this neat form. Gates, Irvine, Sullivan, Wayne, and Schuyler are the more important writers. The letter of Irvine tells a gruesome story of the treatment of deserters and those who tempted them. It would form a good text for an Anti-War Society. A portrait of Washington (one of Peale's) and two minor illustrations are given. Mr. G. M. Philips is the editor, and the pamphlet is privately printed.

'Figures Contemporaines,' by Bernard Lazare (Paris: Perrin & Cie.), is one of those collections of newspaper articles to which journalists are becoming decidedly too partial. Newspaper writing seldom has the polish and the literary finish one expects to meet with in critical studies presented to us in book form. But it is not even studies that M. Lazare gives here; it is the sketchiest kind of talk about a number of writers, fifty altogether, who belong to the past and the present, the immediate past and present. He is apparently desirous of distinguishing himself as a *frondeur;* and while some of the things he says are no doubt true, the general tone of the articles smacks too much of their origin—the columns of a lively newspaper whose business it is above all to be entertaining. Nothing is added to our knowledge of the authors treated of, and something is taken from our enjoyment of them.

The second series of René Doumic's 'Études sur la Littérature Française' is published by Perrin & Cie. The reproach addressed to Lazare's bookful of emptiness cannot be transferred to M. Doumic's, which offers substantial reading and information well put in literary form. The influence of the great critic who now presides over the fortunes of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* is visible in the ideas expressed and also in the style, though in neither case does the originality of M. Doumic suffer from the fact. He, too, speaks fearlessly what is in his mind, even if he lacks the force and the authority of M. Brunetière. His articles on Madame Geoffrin and Madame Roland, on Zola, Goncourt, and France, appear to us to merit the praise of outspokenness and justice. He is not blinded by the great reputation of any one of the quintet, and seeks evidently to give what to him is the true view of their merits and demerits. M. Doumic is writing better than he did, and gain-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing something of a charm of manner in his appreciations which considerably heightens their value from the literary point of view.

The perplexing task of critically grouping the productions of recent and contemporary German writers has been remarkably well performed by Adolf Bartels in 'Die Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart; die Alten und die Jungen' (Leipzig: Avenarius). The author, himself one of the younger members of the craft, gives evidence of very extensive reading and great independence, originality, and soundness of judgment. It is only by means of such a survey as this that one can realize not only the great literary activity in Germany during the last two generations, but also the goodly proportion of truly superior talents among the large number, not to speak of the two or three geniuses or "partial" geniuses. It should be said that the author's standard is high, notwithstanding the large number of names in the index, and that the 114 octavo pages of text are not an annotated catalogue of names and titles, but a noteworthy essay in literary history and criticism, quite as interesting and valuable as the recent publications of Litzmann, Wolff, and others, which do not cover as wide a field as the present work.

A rather pragmatical article by Karl Pearson, on the decadence of German science, which appeared some time ago in *Nature*, and was subsequently the occasion of a sharp polemic, was ostensibly a review of two recent German books, Dreyer's 'Methodenlehre und Erkenntnisskritik,' and Volkmann's 'Grundzüge der Naturwissenschaften,' but the real thesis was "the departing glory of German science." Now it may well be that Dr. Pearson's extended reading justifies his general contention, but it is very unfair to these two books to assume that they would alone justify or even suggest it. Volkmann's at least is a brief, wholly popular, suggestive, and useful book. Written in a minor key, evidently a by-product of more important work, expressly disclaiming the attempt to make a rigid final system, and in no way characteristic of the ordinary German scientific treatise, it was a very unfortunate selection for so weighty a thesis.

Nansen's fine Norse physiognomy in a vigorous etching forms the frontispiece ornament of the new *Minerva*, that invaluable bond between the learned institutions of the world (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner; New York: Lemcke & Buechner). The scope is ever expanding, and the present volume takes in for the first time a number of scientific, archæologic, collegiate and bibliothecal institutions in France, Italy, Greece, and India. The precious index of names has been prepared by Dr. F. Mentz, who will hereafter be a regular member of the staff of *Minerva*.

From Lemcke & Buechner also we receive the handy pocket 'Geschichts-Atlas,' a companion to the 'Atlas Antiquus' issued four years ago by the Gotha firm of Justus Perthes. What is now offered is a chronology of historical events from the Christian era to date, under the respective countries of Europe, with a section allotted to America, not brought down beyond 1865. These tables are followed by maps clearly colored and not too crowded, of which the only American one is of Mexico and the United States. Small as these maps are, every space is utilized for side-maps on a larger scale, so that the series is pretty rich in geographical information.

Finally, the same German and New York firms bring us the issue for 1898 of the venerable *Almanach de Gotha*, in which there are many changes and some wholly new features, such as the articles on Abyssinia and the Grand Republic of Central America, and the sections descriptive of those factors of human brotherhood, the international bureaus and unions for various scientific, humane, and statistical objects. Some stress is laid on the extra trouble imposed on the editors by the diplomatic changes attendant upon President McKinley's accession to office; and that potentate might well feel a pang of remorse when he witnesses the magnanimity displayed in coupling his portrait with that of Queen Victoria and of Queen Wilhelmina of Holland.

The *Musenalmanach* for 1898, edited by Dr. Otto Braun, and published by Cotta in Stuttgart, contains three pieces of prose fiction: "Scharka," by Max Haushofer, "Eigenes Leben," by Ernst Muellenbach, and a most ingenious and entertaining *Märchen*, entitled "Ben Saccaria's Wunderhorn," by J. R. Haarhans. The contributions in verse are by the best of contemporary German poets, among whom W. Jensen, H. Lingg, Max Jordan, G. Scherer, F. Dahn, G. Ebers, H. Vierordt, A. Matthaei, and Agricola von Hörmann may be especially mentioned. There are excellent sonnets by the editor, Otto Braun, and several pungent epigrams by Ludwig Fulda. The volume is neatly printed, and is rendered additionally attractive by six full-page engravings.

Students who are fortunate enough to be familiar with Flemish will welcome the second volume of Dr. Paul Fredericq's 'Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden,' in which he follows the fortunes of the Netherlandish Inquisition and its victims during the fourteenth century. The period here treated is, perhaps, the most interesting one in the Low Countries, prior to the rise of Protestantism, as it comprises the overthrow of the Templars, the persecution of the Beguines and Begghards, the remarkable developments of the Flagellants and the Dancing Mania, and the various forms of mysticism, more or less moral, in which the boundary line between orthodoxy and heterodoxy was so nebulous that a man like Gerard Groot might either be persecuted himself or be an inquisitor persecuting others. The history is further varied by the competition between the Episcopal and the Papal Inquisitions, and the intervention of the secular power, either to use the Holy Office as its tool or to limit its field of action, as the politics of the moment might suggest. Professor Fredericq's familiarity with the sources, and skill in exposition, are too thoroughly recognized to render it necessary for us to do more than express the regret that he has not chosen to render his labors accessible to a wider circle of readers than will be able to derive benefit from them in the idiom in which they are presented.

The Programme of the Royal Statistical Society, London, for the current session, which opened so strikingly on the 14th of December with President Courtney's inaugural address, is to be followed on the 18th of January by a paper from Sir George Baden-Powell, M.P., who has taken the Colonial Empire under his special care, and will discourse upon the Foreign Trade of the British Colonies. Other subjects to be dealt with are: "Old Age Pensions," by Sir Henry C. Burdett; "Female Employment in Factories, with special reference to its effects on the health of the employed and of their children," by Miss Clara E. Collet, M.A.; "Further Notes on the Utility of Common Statistics," by Sir Robert Giffen, recently Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trade, now retired on pension; "Local Taxation in London," by G. Laurence Gomme; "Poor Relief in Scotland; its Statistics and Development, 1791 to 1891," by C. S. Loch; and "Life Tables, and the Registrar-General's Mortality Statistics," by A. C. Waters. Contrary to the usual custom of London societies, the statisticians have their meetings first and their dinners afterwards, and very good the latter are, as those who have joined them know.

I. Zangwill, Professor Dowden, Édouard Rod, and Karl Frenzel pay tribute to the memory of Heinrich Heine in *Cosmopolis* for December. The personality of the poet, the pathos of his life and long agony, the complexity of his character, have proved the most tempting side of the subject to the English and French writers. The veteran writer Karl Frenzel discusses the worth and influence of Heine's poetry, which he is disposed, in a measure, to rank among world literature.

The *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for December contains a summary of recent investigations of the surface currents of the North Sea, made in order to ascertain their part "in transporting the floating or pelagic eggs and larvæ of marine fishes." Two kinds of floats—bottles and strips of wood—were used, and "the results showed that the bottles were much more reliable than the wooden slips." Among the conclusions reached were, that the circulation was from the north of Scotland southerly to the Wash, and thence northeast along the Danish and Norwegian coasts; that the average daily speed of the movement was about two or three geographical miles, and that the principal cause of the circulation is "probably the influence of the prevailing winds." There is also an account of the climate, products, and industries of Queensland, and a slight sketch of the antiquities and legends of Anaga, a district of the island of Teneriffe.

The latest *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie* opens with an account of an exploration of the river Kota in the French Congo. One of the greatest obstacles to the progress of the expedition was the frequency of tornadoes, of which there were often two in the course of a day. This is followed by a description of a tour in Cyprus, made for the purpose of observing the traces of the French colonists who followed the Crusaders. Incidentally the author, M. C. Enlart, praises the British rule as a model of administration, and refers especially to the efforts being made to reforest certain districts, by prohibiting the pasturage of goats and the planting of the eucalyptus. In some notes upon districts of the French Ivory Coast, there is an interesting account of the native methods of gold-mining. Shafts are sunk to the depth of from sixty to a hundred and fifty feet, in groups of six or eight, which are joined by tunnels. The blocks of quartz, when detached, are drawn to the surface by ropes made of vines, and are carried to the village. Here they are crushed and washed. In one of the districts a native can, by three or four months of hard labor, make, above his expenses, an ounce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or an ounce and a half of gold dust. The only currency is gold dust, which is valued at three francs the gramme.

The climate of eastern Siberia is the subject of the first article in the *Annales de Géographie* for November, of which the special purpose is to show its resemblances to and differences from the climate of the North American regions in the same latitude. This is followed by a sketch of Russian explorations in Central Asia from those of Przhevalsky, in 1871, to the present time. Upon an admirable map are traced the routes of thirty-two different expeditions. Among the most interesting of these is that of the Kalmuck lama Baza-Baksha, who, during a three-years' pilgrimage to the Buddhist sanctuaries, visited Lhassa. An account of his travels in Kalmuck, with a Russian translation, has just been published in St. Petersburg, the first book of the kind in that language. There is also a description of the little known district of Cao-Bang, on the northeastern frontier of Tonkin, which is apparently rich in undeveloped resources. The soil is capable of yielding all tropical productions; valuable trees (as the paper mulberry), bamboo, and aromatic plants grow in great profusion; and on the accompanying map are noted numerous gold and iron mines. The inhabitants consist principally of three native races, differing fundamentally from the Annamese and Chinese, whose attempts at subjugation and assimilation they have successfully resisted. This district is traversed by three great trade routes, leading to important Chinese cities.

The Maryland Geological Survey, recently instituted, and now in charge of Prof. W. B. Clark of Johns Hopkins University, has lately issued its first report, in liberally handsome form and with an abundant supply of useful material. General sketches of the physical and geological features of the State and of their exploration occupy nearly 200 pages; a bibliography covers seventy pages; and a first report upon a magnetic survey, by Prof. Bauer of Chicago University, fills 120 pages. The volume is well illustrated with maps and plates.

The appropriateness of an association between geological and magnetic surveys is illustrated in a recent article in the *Journal* of the Franklin Institution by B. S. Lyman of Philadelphia, who discovers a surprising correspondence between certain slight deflections of the magnetic lines in the eastern part of Pennsylvania and the course of a profound fracture or fault by which the deep underground structures are dislocated. The dislocation occurred so long ago in the earth's history that the surface inequality on its two sides has been obliterated by denudation; the line of the fracture is practically invisible, under the soil, but it is nevertheless located by the discordance of the adjacent rock formations. The fault line and the magnetic deflections were determined independently, and yet present a remarkable accordance. Delicate magnetic observations may therefore come to be applied in future to tracing concealed geological structures.

On retiring from the rectorship of the University of Vienna, October 28, 1897, the distinguished Oriental scholar Prof. Leo Reinisch delivered an address, in which he expressed his warm approval of the enlightened policy of that institution in admitting students to its privileges without distinction of sex. He stated that during the past year Gabriele von Posanner had, on completing the regular course of study in the medical department and passing a satisfactory examination, received the degree of M.D., and that this was the first time the University had conferred such a distinction on a woman. The progress of civilization, he added, is constantly increasing the complexity of human life, and thus presenting new problems for solution. Under the present social and industrial conditions young women of the better class, but of moderate means, can be saved from physical, intellectual, and moral deterioration only by having full scope for the development of their mental powers. The higher education of woman, he thinks, will tend to prevent "the money-bag from being the chief motive to marriage," but will not interfere with her functions and duties as wife and mother. In this connection he alludes to the well-known fact that the great men who have exerted the most powerful and permanent influence upon the intellectual development of mankind, have been, as a rule, the children of intellectually superior women; while, on the other hand, the decline of Mohammedan civilization in the Orient is due, for the most part, to the systematic exclusion of women from all higher culture, thereby stunting their mental faculties and nullifying their proper influence on social life and the education of the rising generation.

One of the fruits of the present agitation of the woman question in Germany is a concise biography of Mary Wollstonecraft, with an admirable analysis and appreciation of her 'Vindication of the Rights of Woman,' by Helene Richter. It is published in Vienna.

—The *Century* for January contains an elaborate account, by George Byron Gordon, under the title "The Mysterious City of Honduras," of the recent explorations and discoveries at Copan. It is nearly sixty years since Stephens made the world acquainted with the fact that in the heart of Central America existed the remains of a prehistoric city, interesting in the same way that Baalbec and Palmyra are interesting, but perhaps more mysterious. Many an American of mature years can recall the astonishment with which he first saw Stephens's plates. "Skepticism and mistrust," as stated by Mr. Gordon, they could but excite in the mind of any casual reader. But the explorations and excavations since Stephens's day, and especially those recently conducted by the Harvard Peabody Museum, in which Mr. Gordon has played an important part, have only proved the truth and accuracy of the early narrative, while they have deepened the mystery. Until the Maya hieroglyphs and maguey books can be deciphered, we cannot know much of the history of the civilization of which Copan seems to have been the capital city; but in its remains we have a stupendous archæological fact, such as science must puzzle over for a long time to come. The drawings show us sculpture, monoliths, altars, stairways, "temples, palaces, and piles stupendous," covering the site of a city seven or eight miles long and two miles wide, neither Aztec nor Indian —ruins, perhaps, before the "halls of the Montezumas" were designed—the remains of a people once possessed of an advanced civilization, the key to which we possess, while the means of using it is gone. Gustav Kobbé contributes an article on "Every-Day Heroism" which is well worth reading. It is a collection of stories from actual life of heroic self-sacrifice in the performance sometimes of ordinary duty, and sometimes of something very much out of the range of ordinary duty. Heroism from the earliest times has meant a great variety of things, and the heroes of blood and war have had so much space devoted to them that it is no more than fair that the magazines should give some attention now to the heroes of peace, as the *Century* is doing. Hero-worship is a good cult if the heroes are well chosen; but for an industrial people they ought not to be selected from the annals of rapine and slaughter. In passing, we may suggest as a hint towards the production of another paper in this series, that one of the supreme tests of heroism is endurance—not the capacity, fine though it be, to "hold her nozzle agin' the bank" while others look on, nor to perform a single act of glorious self-devotion, but to undergo cheerfully. Christian heroism this used to be called, but the pagans knew something of it, too. Mr. Kobbé is evidently on the right track.

—The *Atlantic* for January has a curious article on "The Present Scope of Government," by Eugene Wambaugh, in which an attempt is made once more to restate an old problem, that of the true "sphere of government." Prof. Wambaugh enumerates what he calls the "enlarged" functions of government, and gives about three pages of them, beginning with the promotion of morality, and ending with the ownership and care of cemeteries. His list might have been longer, for there is hardly any department of life into which the government of civilized societies does not introduce regulations of some sort, but the writer seems to be on a false scent. He thinks as soon as government becomes popular, it is immediately guided by an intention to promote the common welfare, and there ceases to be any visible reason for "emphasizing the old formula"; the old formula being "the philosophical theory as to the benefits of natural liberty." This is an idea which has been fostered in the past by American politicians and enthusiasts; but we have never seen it seriously advanced before by a serious writer on government, that watchfulness against invasions of liberty ceases to be of importance when the institutions of a country become democratic. When we think of the new Tammany slate, it is amusing to read that "an intention to promote the common welfare" is almost invariably the rule with us. A much more accurate proposition is that "the actual scope of government must continue to be the resultant of the interplay of a natural desire for enlargement of governmental functions and an equally natural repugnance to unnecessary enlargement." How much further, however, does this advance us in the inquiry? The essay is clever but vague, owing, as we shrewdly suspect, to a want of clearness on the writer's part as to the true method and limits of political inquiry. Mr. E. M. Shepard has an elaborate article on what might be called Greater Tammany ("Political Inauguration of the Greater New York"), in which he takes a cheerful view of our future. Every one will be glad to know that he is undismayed, but the foundation of his hope is simply the undeniable fact that, as we have improved

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

non obstante Tammany, so we shall continue to improve in the future. This is what we have always maintained in these columns, and no fair-minded man can call the view pessimistic.

—Stories, poetry, information, and pictures all go to the making of a magazine, and of these the greatest in bulk seem to be stories. Even when the contribution belongs under the head of information, it is called a story, if possible, and thus *Scribner's* is able to save Mr. Lodge's account of the Revolution from being avoided as history. His "Story of the Revolution—the First Step—the First Blow," is made as light a narrative as possible, and is accompanied by many entertaining illustrations. The other contribution to which the publishers call attention on the cover is Mr. Thomas Nelson Page's "Red Rock," the first instalment of a novel of the war. Bret Harte's doggerel on "The Birds of Cirencester" (told for children *à la* Ingoldsby Legends) is good in its way. This, and some of the other January verse, lead us to wonder whether the public was not mistaken in supposing that the magazines brought out their avalanche of December poetry as their best in stock. To judge by the January improvement, the Christmas verse was simply an inferior lot worked up to look attractive and to be absorbed by the holiday market.

—In *Harper's*, Laurence Hutton has an article called "A Group of Players," which contains several pleasant anecdotes of Booth, Wallack, Barrett, and others. Mr. Hutton's knowledge of the stage and of actors is very great, and he generally recalls characteristic touches. Thus, no one who ever saw Lawrence Barrett can fail to be amused at learning that, while he had a simple and unaffected pride in his humble origin, he was terribly annoyed by a rumor that his real name was "Larry Brannigan." Of Booth's eccentricities and generosity many examples are given, and a conversation is recalled which embodies a phrase showing his keen interest in what may be called the affinity of the arts. Of Lester Wallack it is said his weakness as a writer of reminiscences was his fondness for dwelling "on what his father had said to the Duke of Wellington," "to the exclusion of his father's conversation with Elliston or Kean." A curious fate now threatens a successful actor in the phonograph. It seems that a "nickel-in-the-slot" machine has been constructed which preserves for ever, among other things, "the ravings of John McCullough," *i. e.*, lunatic scraps from *Virginius*, *Spartacus*, and *Brutus*, given in his voice and winding up with an insane laugh. A very pleasant paper is that on Stuttgart by Elise J. Allen. The illustrations and text together make an excellent guide-book to the old Suabian city, and the writer has the great qualification, which so many Americans and English people lack, of understanding the German character. This is most of all important in Suabia, where the naïveté of the race reaches a point which seems ludicrous even to the German mind. To many foreigners all Germans are Suabians, but we can hardly be mistaken in thinking that the land of Grimm's heroic "Seven Suabians" is the only spot in Germany which could have produced and preserved the legend of the old judge here given.

—Upon the discovery, in 1855, of Bradford's Journal in the Bishop of London's Fulham palace, permission to copy it was granted to the Massachusetts Historical Society. Taking advantage of this favor, and for securing "a fair and exact transcript" of the only original and continuous chronicle of the Pilgrim church and colony for its first half century, the services of Rev. Joseph Hunter, an officer of the British Museum, were secured. Mr. Hunter (famous for discovering the acting of "Twelfth Night" in the Middle Temple in 1602) engaged a gentleman who he knew "would execute the work in a scholar-like and business-like manner"; he "gave attention and supervision while it was in progress," and at its close reported: "The transcriber has done his work in a very satisfactory manner, preserving all the peculiarities of Bradford's writing, and the copy is, I think, as perfect a representation of the original as could well be made. I have perused the copy, turning often to the original when I thought there might be some error, and there has hardly been an instance in which I did not find it exact. I made the collation with much attention," etc. The gratification of the Massachusetts Society in receiving the copy, they declared to be "second only to that which would be experienced at the sight of the original," and they published it immediately, filling therewith the third volume of their fourth series. None of their multitudinous issues is more valuable or more interesting, or has been considered so accurate and authentic. The rescue, however, of the original itself from British captivity by Mr. Bayard, and its coming home to Boston in 1897, must subject the Hunterian copy to a new test. Indeed, the photographic facsimile executed last year and now scattered through the world must lead to the detection of errors hitherto unsuspected in the London transcript.

—A very noteworthy omission, amounting to nine consecutive lines, has met the eye of the present writer. It occurs on p. 179 of the Boston volume and p. 122 in the facsimile. The following lines not found in the former work are copied literatim from the latter, the facsimile:

having their libertie to make their own provissions. But some of these which came last, as the ship carpenter, and sawiers, the salte men, and others that were to follow constante employments, and had not an howers time from their hard labours, to looke for any thing above their alowance; they had at first 16 ^{w} alowed them, and afterwards as fish & other food could be got, they had abatemente to 14 & 12, yea some of them to 8, as the times and occasions did vary. And yet thos which followed planting & their own occasions & had but 4 ^{w}

After detecting this serious omission, the present writer at once recognized it as a case of what is technically styled *homœoteleuton*, or sameness of endings. The last words in the facsimile before "having their libertie," which is the first clause in the omitted lines, are "had but 4 ^{w}." But these words are identical with the last words in those omitted lines. It is clear that the scribe had written them where they first appear, and, when he would go on in his task, mistook their second appearance for the first, and so wrote only the words following that second, unawares leaving nine lines uncopied. This palpable mistake, in spite of manifold and careful endeavors to guard against such a mortification, is not the only one in the Massachusetts printed copy. It emphasizes the value of original documents.

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1653.—I.

History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1660. By Samuel Rawson Gardiner, M.A. Vol. II. 1651-1654. Longmans, Green & Co. 1897. 8vo, xxii and 503 pp.

Historians of the Commonwealth are overpowered by the personality of the Protector; even Mr. Gardiner cannot entirely escape from the disease of Cromwellianism. Readers of his last volume, admirable though it be, may reasonably regret that the pages expended on a candid but sympathetic analysis of Cromwell's motives and aims have not been devoted to a thorough examination of the remarkable constitutional experiment which ought to make the year 1653 for ever noteworthy. A reviewer, at any rate, may be allowed to dismiss from his mind the interesting but unimportant inquiry as to the proportions in which enthusiasm and public spirit were in Cromwell mingled with duplicity and ambition, and may reasonably endeavor to bring into prominence the characteristics of the earliest (as it is one of the most ingenious) of written constitutions. The Instrument of Government (or, as we should now say, the Constitution) of 1653 merits attention, and this for two reasons. It was the type of a new kind of polity; and a study of the Instrument shows that Puritan constitutionalism was in its essence, even more than in its form, essentially unlike the constitutionalism of modern England.

What, then, were the main characteristics of this earliest of written constitutions? The constitution which anticipated the treaties of Union and welded England, Scotland, and Ireland into one state, is marked by four salient features. The Executive constituted under the Instrument of Government was the strongest executive which has ever existed in England. "The Government," to use modern phraseology, was not the Protector, but, a very different thing, the Protector and his Council. This body was endowed with the widest authority; it held in its hands the whole civil administration; it had complete control of the armed forces; it determined the foreign policy of the state; it had the right to declare war and make peace; and these constitutional powers were supported by adequate resources. Under the Constitution were maintained an army of at least 30,000 men and a sufficient number of ships; and for the support of the military and naval forces there was provided a constant yearly revenue, while the Constitution also insured to the Government £200,000 per annum—which, we take it, was equivalent to about a million of our money—for the maintenance of what we should now call the civil service. These revenues were not dependent for their existence on an annual or other act of Parliament. They could be legally raised under the Constitution without any Parliamentary authority.

At the head of this powerful Executive stood the Protector; but the Council itself was a body well adapted for the effective exercise of power. It consisted of not less than thirteen nor of more than thirty members; it might, that is to say, be a little smaller than a modern English cabinet, and was, when raised to its full number, not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much larger than the Senate in the time of Washington. Every Councillor held office for life; he could be removed only for actual and proved breaches of duty, such, for example, as corruption. He held his position, that is to say, on a tenure even more certain than the tenure by which English judges have held their places since 1689. The first body of Councillors were appointed under the Instrument. Vacancies, as they occurred, were to be filled up by a complicated system of appointment, which, as far as one can judge, would have led to the result that, while few men would have become Councillors who were not members of Parliament, no man could be chosen who was not acceptable to the Council; and it is no bold conjecture that, had the Instrument of Government remained in full force, the Council would in effect have filled up vacancies in its body by coöptation. The Protector, it will be said, towered above the Council. As regards Cromwell, this is obviously true, though Cromwell, as Mr. Gardiner points out, was at the Council board no despot, and his Councillors were no ciphers; but, under the Constitution of 1653, succeeding Protectors would have in all likelihood become the leaders or even the servants of the Council, for the Council, among its other attributes, had the right of electing the Protector, and all experience shows that a small body of statesmen with the right of electing their head will in general succeed in choosing, as they will always endeavor to choose, that one of their members who will carry into effect the wishes of the electors. And however this may be, in considering what was the authority of the Executive under the Instrument of Government, we must look upon it as a body which would usually act in harmony with the Protector. Whenever this was the case, the Council created by the Instrument of Government was constituted so as to possess greater powers than have fallen to any King or Cabinet since the time when the House of Commons became an essential part of the English polity.

Henry the Eighth, it may be suggested, committed acts of tyranny which could never have been perpetrated by the Protector and his Council. This is true, but the prerogatives of the Tudors, ample though they were, were limited on every side by custom. No Tudor possessed a standing army; no Tudor could despise the power of Parliament. The authority of Henry and of Elizabeth rested on their capacity for recognizing the permanent will of the nation. Modern cabinets, again, have disposed of armed forces, and have expended revenues, incomparably larger than the armies or the revenues at the disposal of Cromwell, but the strongest of ministries has been dependent for its very existence on the support of Parliament, or, in truth, of the House of Commons. The Cromwellian Council was a permanent body which was intended to outlast one Parliament after another; and, what is of even more consequence, the power of the Council was not in reality balanced by a body with anything like the weight of the houses which had at times withstood the wilfulness of Elizabeth, and had, during the Civil War, destroyed the power of the Crown. For the single House of Representatives elected under the Constitution of 1653, though called a Parliament, was in reality a very different thing—a mere legislature. This transformation of Parliament into a legislature was, in truth, one of the main alterations introduced into the Constitution of England, though nothing is more probable than that the Constitutionalists of the Commonwealth did not fully recognize the nature of the revolution which they had effected.

The first Parliament of the Protectorate possessed, indeed, some prerogatives or advantages which did not belong to the Parliaments of the monarchy. It became an essential part of the new system of government, it was necessarily convened every three years, and, when so assembled, could not be adjourned, prorogued, or dissolved for five months. It was, further, what we should now call a reformed Parliament; it was so constituted as, in theory at least, to reflect the will of the people far more accurately than did the House of Commons at any time up to the great Reform Bill of 1832. The small boroughs—the rotten or nomination boroughs of later times—were abolished, the rising towns received representatives, the centre of political power (as far as it depended upon parliamentary representation) was in the main transferred from the population of the towns to the country electors, and among the country electorate there was no residuum of poor laborers. Every elector was required to possess property worth £200, or, if we allow for the change in the value of money, property real or personal which would be worth at the present day about £1,000. The object of the Cromwellian reformers clearly was the same as the object proposed to themselves by Chatham and his son, namely, the vesting of political authority in the small but independent country landowners. Whether this change would ultimately have strengthened Parliament is open to question, but it certainly was intended to give moral authority to the representative body. To all this we must add that, in matters of ordinary legislation—in all matters, that is to say, which did not touch the Constitution—Parliament was endowed with absolute authority. It was authorized to pass bills over the head (as we should now say) of the Protector. All that he could in strictness do was to insist upon the reconsideration of measures which did not meet with his approval. In matters of legislation, the Protector possessed nothing but the dilatory veto which the Constitution of the French Republic has conferred on the President, and which no President has ventured to use. But, for all this, Parliament was deprived by the Instrument of Government of the powers by whose exercise the House of Commons has finally obtained an authority hardly distinguishable from sovereignty. To Parliament was given only an indirect share in the appointment of the Council. It was denied the means of dismissing a single Councillor from office; it ceased to wield without restraint the power of the purse, for considerable revenues were by the Constitution itself guaranteed to the Protector; nor did the legislative powers of Parliament remain unlimited, for they could be exercised only in accordance with the Constitution.

For the third and most important of the changes introduced by the Constitution of 1653 was, if we may use modern terms, the transformation of a "flexible" into a "rigid" Constitution. According to the view taken by Mr. Gardiner, the Instrument of Government made the whole of its provisions—or, in other words, every article of the Constitution—immutable. There is nothing in itself unreasonable in this interpretation of the Instrument. During the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, lawyers who used strongest language about the authority of Parliament held in effect that Parliament—a term which in their mouths of course meant the Crown and the two houses—would not or could not constitutionally change the fundamental laws of the realm. The Puritan leaders, though forced, under the stress of circumstances, to become revolutionists, were in spirit stanch Conservatives. Their indignation had been excited by the despotic innovations of the Crown, and the preservation of liberty was in their minds associated with the rigid maintenance of established custom and inherited rights. It must never be forgotten that it was not the enlightenment of Bacon, but the crabbed legalism of Coke, which earned the veneration of parliamentarians. It is therefore quite possible that the authors of the Constitution of 1653 wished to endow the fundamental institutions of the state with a fixity which, though not secured by law, has been in fact insured by the force of custom. But to any one who studies the Instrument of Government with the eye rather of a lawyer than of an historian, the fact, strange though it be, soon becomes apparent that its unknown authors were men of subtle intellects and of great sagacity, and that, with a foresight rarely found among the framers of constitutions, they had provided the means for constitutionally changing the greater part, at any rate, of the polity which they had framed.

A careful perusal of Article 24 leads to the following result: Laws were by the Constitutionalists of 1653 divided into three classes: (1.) Ordinary laws, which did not touch the provisions of the Instrument, or, in other words, which did not affect the Constitution. Such laws could be enacted by Parliament with or without the consent of the Protector. (2.) Laws which amended the Constitution, but did not affect certain fundamental provisions thereof referring in the main to religious freedom; such laws could be enacted by Parliament with the consent of the Protector, but not otherwise. (3.) Laws which affected or restrained the effect of these "fundamentals" contained in articles 35 to 37; such laws, if so they can be called, could not be enacted at all: they were *ab initio* invalid. On this point the Instrument is absolutely clear. Article 38 enacts "that all laws, statutes, and ordinances, and clauses in any law, statute, or ordinance to the contrary of the aforesaid liberty, shall be esteemed as null and void." The "aforesaid liberty" is of course the religious liberty guaranteed by the Constitution, and it may be well to note that, with a tenderness for religious freedom which may perhaps be fairly attributable to the breadth of Cromwell's own sympathies, the very article which invalidates any law that should restrict, does not invalidate any law which should extend, the sphere of spiritual liberty. However this may be, it is plain that the Constitution was not in reality as a whole unchangeable. The greater number of its articles could be changed by Parliament with the assent of the Protector. The only amendments which were constitutionally forbidden were amendments, if so we may call them, intended to restrict the guarantees for freedom of religion.

Here we come across the fourth noteworthy feature of the Constitution of 1653.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It introduced into the world that conception of guaranteed rights which is familiar to the Constitutionalists of every country but England. Whatever be the logical merits of this idea, it has certainly been fully accepted by the people of countries such as the United States and Switzerland, where religious and political freedom has flourished; and any one who reflects upon the nature of English law and the habits and traditions of English and of American courts may feel a conviction, as certain as it is allowable for any sensible man to entertain about events which have not happened, that, could the Constitution of 1653 have held its ground, the existence of a written and more or less rigid Constitution which guaranteed certain rights would, in England, as it did in a later age in America, have changed the whole position of the judiciary. Once acknowledge that a law passed by the Legislature is null and void, because it contravenes an article of the Constitution, and a court influenced by the ideas common to the whole English people will be certain to hold that, in any given case, the courts must treat such law as a nullity. But if this be once conceded, the result inevitably follows that the Judges must pass judgment upon the constitutionality of laws, or, in other words, the judiciary must become the protector of the Constitution. It is no vain imagination that, had the Instrument of Government remained the supreme law of the land, Hale might in England have performed the task and obtained the fame which in the United States fell to the lot of Marshall.

Here, then, we have embodied in the Instrument of Government as remarkable—we may perhaps say as admirable—a constitution as has ever been consciously framed by men bent on founding a well-grounded commonwealth. If we look simply at its terms, we should think the Constitution of 1653 at least as well constructed and as likely to endure as the Constitution of the United States. We all know that the Constitution of 1653 had no permanence, and that its very existence has been all but forgotten by Englishmen. In another article we shall consider what were the reasons why the Constitutionalists of the Commonwealth failed utterly in the attempt to erect a Government which should secure to the English Commonwealth the advantages both of order and of liberty.

RECENT FICTION.

St. Ives. By Robert Louis Stevenson. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Captains Courageous. By Rudyard Kipling. The Century Company.

Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker. By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D. The Century Company.

King Washington. By Adelaide Skeel and William H. Brearley. J. B. Lippincott Co.

An Open-Eyed Conspiracy: A Saratoga Idyl. By W. D. Howells. Harper & Brothers.

The most careless reader of Mr. Stevenson's novels has probably suspected that, besides being a first-rate story-teller, the author might be, in many other lights, an unusual and rather fine sort of man. With that knowledge of his actual life which is public property, on closing 'St. Ives' the longest thought can hardly fail to be about the man, particularly about a spirit so bright and a courage so dauntless that his great gift of story-telling seems in comparison but a common thing, a quality of mind borrowing distinction from less obtrusive qualities of soul. The swan of fable singing as it dies, the soldier shouting for his country as he falls, and the captain calmly going down with his ship, all captivate the multitude conscious of a certain moral splendor about figures facing death with such serenity and fearlessness. 'St. Ives' compels us to dwell upon an even more impressive exit from life, and to find even more heroic the figure of a peaceful man of letters who, lying long in the jaws of death, resolutely defied pain and, knowing no fear, took his leave with the grace and gayety of Lovelace going to the wars.

The fine figures of Mr. Stevenson's creation represent two classes—men whose actions are governed by the fear of God and a stern interpretation of the moral law, Hebraic rather than Christian; and men who would be raging heathen but for the saving virtues of honor, courage, and courtesy. For himself, he could not help belonging to the one that was his breed; and by romantic temperament and æsthetic sympathy he was able to identify himself with the other. In creating the gentleman of many aliases, Viscount Anne de Keroual de Saint-Yves, he threw off the restraints of heredity and upbringing and became a bold, witty, graceless, gallant noble of France and soldier of the empire. None of his scampish adventurers is more freely and naturally drawn than St. Ives, and of all he is the most astute, light-hearted, and attractive. Viscount Anne is a worldling *de race;* neither the horrors of a childhood spent in the shadow of the guillotine, nor hard apprenticeship in the practice of war, as Champdivers, private, Eighth of the line, nor constant association with "brawling, bruising, ignorant pillars of low pot-houses," had power to chasten his external frivolity, or could teach him to regard any situation as too serious to be mastered by ready wit and beautiful manners. Perilous adventure was, of course, the breath of his nostrils, and he would far rather fight than eat or sleep; or, at least, no one can doubt his preference, though, as a matter of fact, he is always conspicuously running away.

The first flight, from Edinburgh Castle to the English home of the Count de Keroual, is a splendid bit of narrative pressing on at hot pace, yet leisurely enough for ample characterization of people and places and for love-making and brawling by the way. Up to the parting with the Gilchrists at Swanston cottage, the illustration of the art of story-telling is pretty nearly perfect, and if we had to make a choice of the most vivid and entertaining scene in all Mr. Stevenson's novels we should hardly hesitate to say, "Chapter ix. of 'St. Ives'." The second flight, in the claret-colored chaise, with the wrathful disinherited Viscount Alain in full chase, has not the same authority, the same easy command of material and expression, while the third flight—all that follows the Assembly ball—is a comparatively disorderly scamper. It happens that at the Assembly ball Mr. Stevenson left off and Mr. Quiller Couch, working from the author's notes, finished the tale. No one can say what Mr. Stevenson would have done with his notes, but when we remember the fantastic and unrelated ending of 'The Ebb Tide' there is no certainty that he would have spared us Viscount Anne's adventures in the balloon, or the voyage with the mysterious Captain Colenso—an extravagance which no author except Mr. Frank Stockton could perpetrate and be forgiven. Mr. Stevenson's taste was not faultless; yet it is not probable that he would have crowded the final scenes in Paris with such commonplace devices, or overwhelmed Viscount Alain with such melodramatic defeat.

The conclusion of St. Ives's love story seems to us more in Mr. Stevenson's manner than the narrative of adventures. Always shy of the passion of love, Mr. Stevenson, in using it as a motive, conceded the smallest possible amount of emotional and sentimental detail, and Mr. Quiller Couch scrupulously respects his reticence. Though the lovers are always head over ears in trouble, St. Ives is as gay as a lark, and Miss Flora Gilchrist far from a love-lorn damsel. She has practical sense and courage in adversity, qualities which, when embodied in a beautiful woman, went to make the sort of woman that, so far as he has given us his confidence, Mr. Stevenson most admired. As St. Ives, incessantly playing with tragedy, is never tragic, and only once, in describing his relations with a transient figure, the aged French Colonel, achieves pathos, there is no scope for Mr. Stevenson's most impressive style, no passage where the poet's presence is intimated in impassioned prose. But as an example of his narrative style, his gift for telling just what was seen and said and done, of giving a distinct personality even to the least of the actors in the drama, he has left us nothing so characteristic as 'St. Ives' except 'Kidnapped.' The Viscount's perfect command of the descriptive epithet is alone enough to insure him a long literary life.

Good a story-teller as Mr. Stevenson was, if the test is ability to give an impression of truth, Mr. Kipling is perhaps a better one. This is not to say that he is a bigger figure in letters, for that emphatically he is not—a declaration which some serious seeker for truth may hereafter attempt to make good, or perchance refute, in a bulky and unprofitable volume. But, for the stories, in the last analysis a candid admirer may be forced to admit that perhaps none of Mr. Stevenson's could be quite and all true, while even an enemy could display only childish rancor in denying to every one of Mr. Kipling's the seal of a scornful veracity. Equally profitless would it be to dispute their interest. He imagines things so strongly, and he knows things so well, that subjects, however alien to our thought and tastes, become at once of the utmost importance. We reproach ourselves for having lived so long in neglect or contempt of them. The cod-fishing industry is not intrinsically, of itself, apart from Mr. Kipling, an occupation that invites attention from those who dwell remote from the Banks, knowing the fish chiefly as a substance triangular and tough, with no suggestion of the ocean about it except the salt. Cod-fishing has never been made a "cause," that we should shout for it, or even denounced as a pleasant vice, that we should hasten to know it in order to suppress it. Cod-fishing, except for fishers and their families, has always been but a name for a transaction on the deep which nobody could be expected to inquire into. All this until Mr. Kipling chose to sweep the pampered son of an American millionaire off from the decks

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of an Atlantic steamer into a fisherman's dory and set him to catch, split, and salt cod for three months. Thus suddenly knowledge about cod-fishing has been widely diffused; it has become picturesque, absorbingly interesting in every detail, and doubtless a source of hope and consolation to the parents of insufferable boys. The description of Harvey Cheyne's apprenticeship on board the *We're Here* is a capital expression of Mr. Kipling's singular ability for investing plain facts with the arresting charm of fiction by imparting his own vigorous interest in them to the reader. The abrupt, disagreeable first chapter, and the chapters narrating the rush of the Cheynes across the continent to meet their lost darling, show that rare and wonderful imaginative force which occasionally makes fiction more real than life itself. The characterization of the cod-fishers is feebler, vaguer than anything of Mr. Kipling's we can think of, and the corrupt English which they speak has never been heard on the Gloucester shore or from the deck of a Canuck fishing-smack. On the other hand, Harvey Cheyne is known and detested by every one except his mother wherever a score of Americans may be gathered together. Not less familiar and dismal is Mrs. Cheyne, with her nerves, her doting subservience to the abominable child, her selfish command of the husband so lavish of wealth and with the patience of a thousand donkeys. Mr. Kipling has drawn her with a vindictive irony which implies that he has made arrangements for permanent absence from her country. "She" is not likely to forget the picture of her ridiculous self controlling the railroad system of a continent by her hysterical cry, "Hurry," or to forgive such an innocent-seeming paragraph as that announcing the arrival of the Cheyne special at Chicago: "It is on record that the last crew took entire charge of switching operations at Sixteenth Street, because 'she' was in a doze at last, and heaven was to help any one who bumped her."

The reminiscences of 'Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker,' make a very readable historical novel. Most historical novels are not readable, and, so far, Dr. Mitchell has scored a success. The tale is dull at first; the inherent tediousness of childhood's memories being increased by a formal, constrained style which is mistakenly supposed to give the eighteenth-century *cachet*. Once Wynne is grown up, the story moves, and the style is correspondingly freer and more natural. The long and rather involved tale of love, war, and colonial social life is carefully constructed and linked smoothly; the scenes and situations are vivid, some of them spirited, and there are at least two admirably drawn and strongly contrasted characters—Hugh's father, John Wynne, a sombre-minded Quaker, and his aunt, Miss Gainor Wynne, a sort of chaste colonial Baroness Bernstein.

There are persons still living who suppose, perhaps erroneously, that behind the commercial reasons for the revolt of the Colonies, there was discontent very general, very profound, very passionate, with the rule of kings and the supremacy of aristocracies, and that the Revolution was largely an expression of resentment against the existing social order, and even a protest against the idea which its continued existence involved and proclaimed. Such persons, after reading 'Hugh Wynne,' can hardly escape being confused in mind, and, if imaginatively attached to theories, troubled in spirit. All their cherished ideals are shattered. There is not even a passing bow to freedom, equality, and the rights of man. Jefferson, Franklin, and the rest were not "fathers of the Republic"; they were "founders of an empire." Washington was no impeccable patriot leading his people to a higher destiny. He was a haughty, reserved, arrogant aristocrat, blasphemous at times; he was a soldier of the King, temporarily out of work, and, all on account of a trifling extra cost for a cup of tea, willing to turn his hand against his master and plunge his country into a long war of which the issue was most uncertain. The men who captured Major André, and those who condemned him to death for conspiring with a traitor, were so insensible to the charm of birth and breeding that no gentleman could speak of them without a shudder. Washington felt the ignominy of his own part in the regrettable incident so deeply that he could not permit the unfortunate young Englishman's name to be mentioned in his presence. Arnold himself was not half a bad fellow. It is true and undeniable that he tried to sell his country; but then he had always kept open house in Philadelphia, and had married a daughter of a first family, and had got into luxurious extravagant ways, and really needed a good deal of money to keep him going. Why Hugh Wynne and his Aunt Gainor joined the rebels, it is useless to inquire. All their tastes and habits were aristocratic, and they had plenty of money to pay for tea at any price. Clearly, on the evidence, the Revolution was a colossal folly. A society apparently better-bred, more polished, altogether finer and gayer than anything known in America during this century, was broken up by it, and whatever the people not in the "Governor's set" may have gained by it does not appear in Dr. Mitchell's quite readable historical novel.

This question is not answered in another novel of the Revolution, not quite readable. The title, 'King Washington,' is rather agitating. The "Colonial Dames," the "Daughters of the Revolution," the exclusive Massachusetts coterie of "The Twenty-nine," have compelled us to acknowledge the noble origin of most of the native population of the United States, but have not yet prepared us to believe that Washington ever was, or could have been, or would have been, a king. On page 293 of this novel our incredulity is confirmed by Washington himself. The story is a meandering, romantic account of an attempt to kidnap Washington, when, towards the close of the war, he was in headquarters at Newburgh. A young woman implores him to spare the chief agent of the conspirators. Washington, we are told, "removed his glasses and did not think it beneath his dignity to wipe the tell-tale moisture from his eyes." Then, quite in the good old cherry-tree-and-hatchet manner, he spoke: "The power to pardon does not rest with me. In America no one person is King." It has been the fate of many great men to be misunderstood, but few have been made to appear ridiculous so persistently as Washington.

Mr. Howells's 'Open-Eyed Conspiracy' is one of the light, brilliant performances with which he occasionally amuses himself between serious labors. Mr. and Mrs. March, spending a few weeks at Saratoga, the one philosophical and ironical, the other impulsive and literal, both inveterate meddlers, involve themselves in the affairs of a forlorn rustic beauty. Always protesting that they have nothing to do with it, they get her engaged to marry one of their pet young men. Slight as the episode is, it attracts attention to a change amounting to transformation that American social life has undergone in the last ten or fifteen years. The glory of the Saratoga caravansaries has departed; culture shuns them; fashion recognizes them not; aspiring plutocracy would not be found dead there. Only benighted Cubans imagine them still to be the centres of fashion which ante-bellum legends describe them. There is a crowd, heterogeneous, brilliant, appearing very rich and even splendid, but the presence of a really "nice" person is as rare as that of an angel. All this Mr. March, who knew Saratoga long ago, and still has a fondness for it (a fondness shared, but less frankly owned up to, by Mrs. March), notes, as he sits positively sizzling even in the shade, or strolls beneath the splendid trees, or lounges about the big hotels where he doesn't stop, where Mrs. March wouldn't stop for untold gold. The tone of Mr. March's reflections is genial, humorous, ironical, hardly a serious note; nevertheless, he manages to contribute impressively to that series of social studies which, by their brilliancy and comprehensiveness, we trust may insure for Mr. Howells enduring fame.

NOMINATIONS.

Nominations for Elective Office in the United States. By Frederick W. Dallinger. [Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. IV.] Longmans, Green & Co. 1897.

Mr. Dallinger's book goes over ground which is familiar to every one. He begins with an historical sketch of the nominating machinery in the United States, in which he traces the rise and growth of the present primary and convention system. The sum and substance of this chapter, the drift of which is entirely historical, is to show that the present system is modern. It has little or no relation to the old caucus, nor to the system of self-announced nominations (the English system), at one period common in the South. It is the application of representative, democratic institutions to a purely party business within party lines, and is made the analogue, so far as possible, of those institutions themselves; the primary corresponding to the town or ward meeting, and the convention to the Legislature.

The first chapter is followed by a description of the present system as it exists, and by an account of the defects observed in its operation, while the remainder of the book is occupied with a discussion of the remedies proposed. We shall not weary our readers with rehearsing the shocking story of the abuses of the system, for they may be summed up in a few words: Instead of the primaries and conventions turning out candidates fairly representative of the community, they tend to fall into the hands of a local "ring" headed by a corrupt manager or boss, who himself nominates; the primaries and conventions merely registering his decision, and that decision being dictated mainly by his own private interests. His nominees are, in the main, place-men dependent on the taxes for a living which his favor provides, forming a close corporation or "machine," which effectually bars the door to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any nomination not authorized by him. Through his control of the nominating machinery, he fills all departments of the government with his private agents, and thus, though elections seem to remain free, he really determines whom we shall elect, and becomes himself the government, though he may not hold any office in it. When we come to the question of remedies, we find that a great number have been proposed, among them minority representation and regulation of primaries by law; but the remarkable thing about this part of the book is that the author, whose familiarity with the history of the subject no one can dispute, dismisses all the specifics proposed, and tells us that he knows of but three things likely to have much effect on nominations—a diminution in the number of elective offices, absolute separation of local from national and State politics, and, above all, the abolition of the spoils system, and consequent destruction of the class of professional politicians. We may perhaps throw some light upon the view of the important subject of nomination to which Mr. Dallinger's researches tend, by calling attention to one or two points involved, though not expressly stated, in his study.

Down to very recent times, writers who have discussed the fundamental questions of government have generally failed to foresee the importance of the nominating system in a modern representative democracy enjoying a wide suffrage. In Greece and Rome, owing to the narrow local suffrage and the fact that representative institutions did not exist, the difficulty now felt did not arise. Nor was its future importance anticipated by Montesquieu, Hobbes, or Locke. When the authors of the 'Federalist' discussed the proposed Constitution, and explained the mode contrived for electing the President, their explanation showed that they had never thought about the detailed work of nominations at all. "The people of each State," they said (Fed., No. 671), "shall choose a number of persons as electors," as if this function would be performed by the whole people coming together in a sort of State meeting and balloting. Attention has been frequently directed to the fact that the Electoral College, which they intended to be a body of notables, speedily came to be a body of nobodies—dummies selected by party machinery to cast a foreordained ballot; but it is at least equally curious that the method by which the candidates for electors were to be chosen should not even have occurred to them or to their critics. As they say themselves: "The mode of appointment of the chief magistrate of the United States is almost the only part of the system of any consequence which has escaped without severe censure, or which has received the slightest mark of approbation from its opponents." What they were thinking of when they talked about "the people," was really some small classical, mediæval, or Renaissance city community, the inhabitants of which knew each other more or less by sight, and in which the number enjoying the franchise was very small, and the notables all men of established position, known by sight to everybody in the place. Having in their minds a very different sort of community from that which was destined to establish itself in America, they could not foresee the result of their scheme, and they accordingly gravely state that "they have not made the appointment of the President to depend *on any preëxisting bodies of men, who might be tampered with beforehand to prostitute their votes;* but they have referred it in the first instance to *an immediate act of the People of America.*" Yet to-day the nomination of the candidates does depend on preëxisting bodies of men, and we have only to turn to such a book as the autobiography of Mr. John Sherman or the present account to find that certain portions of these bodies are universally known to be purchasable, while nomination of any one for an office by "an immediate act of the People of America" is a mere phrase signifying nothing.

When Louis Napoleon obtained possession of France and shrewdly constructed a tyranny resting on universal suffrage, it began to be perceived that the business of placing before the people the candidate for whom, or the question on which, they were to vote was no less important than the extension of the right to vote itself. We see the same thing continually in private corporations and stock companies, when stockholders continue bad managers in control because the ticket is made up by the managers themselves, and even vote away their own rights because the method of presenting the question to them is devised by those whose interest it is that these rights shall be voted away. We know now that on the control of nominations the whole character of any government, or the conduct of private corporate affairs, may easily turn. In the long run, any one who controls them must control everything.

Unless we are mistaken, it will be found that whenever the suffrage is very extended and popular, the business of nominating candidates for elective office falls into the hands of a small number of men, or into those of the candidates themselves. Hence, in a democracy, the first question is, What is the character of these bodies? In this country, self-nominated candidates are beginning to reappear (and in our opinion as time goes on their number is likely to increase); but, as a general thing, candidates are nominated by "preëxisting bodies," and the character of the candidates depends in the long run on the character of these bodies. To believe otherwise is to believe that the tree is not to be known by its fruit. Now to-day these bodies are not bodies of distinguished or even responsible men, but aggregations mainly of obscure and irresponsible men, "politicians" by profession, whose very occupation is a by-word, who are frequently corrupt, and who, when not actually dishonest, are biassed against the selection of good candidates by every habit and influence of their lives. The condition of our legislatures, of the Senate of the United States, is enough to show that the machinery of selection works badly, and yet, as we have said, upon the selection of candidates by these or other bodies depends the whole future of the government. Hence, it is the universal conviction of those who have given much attention to the subject, that the present low character of the men turned out as candidates by our nominating system cannot continue if our system itself is to last. The government might go on long after its essential virtue had departed, but, as it degenerated, the country and its civilization would decline; laws would cease to be observed, property and life would become less secure, provision against the future would not be made, debt and expenditures would increase, and in the end, whether through the effect of war or intestine commotion and disorder, rotten forms would be swept out of existence by the strong hand, and some sort of despotism be established in place of the institutions we have known. A cynic might even say with some plausibility that we need not wait, and that we are actually now living in the state of things we dread for our children, that our dumb legislatures are but a modern copy of the silenced Senate of Rome, and our Platts and Crokers the vulgar despots of a vulgar age. To this length we do not go, simply because we are inclined to believe in the inherent power of cure possessed by the germ of freedom—the *vis medicatrix libertatis.* But let no one doubt on what road we are travelling. The sign-post is the working of our system of nominations.

The modern primary and convention system was introduced in order to make nominations more representative, and so they no doubt did for a time; not until a comparatively recent date did the public awake to the fact that the system had fallen into the hands of permanent "preëxisting bodies" or committees, which, under the supervision of a Boss, and to a great extent in his pay, manipulated and prearranged these conventions and primaries. In the days of the caucus and congressional nominations, nothing of the sort was heard of, and we have no doubt that one of the most potent causes of the rapid perfection of the new system, and its present smooth working, was the corruption of the civil service by the spoils system, which, in the years after the war, came to its height and is still most powerful in local and municipal politics. If this view is correct, the gradual improvement of the civil service which is going on all the time must be taking away from the Boss a large part of his capital. The Post-Office and the Custom-House, and even the Navy-yard, are pretty nearly free from his grasp already, and in time the municipal and State service will be; he can still keep a governor and legislature, however, and this he does almost entirely through a rotten nominating system, combined with appeals to party feeling.

Bad as the boss system is, it should show us the direction in which improvement, if at all, is to come. The business of selecting candidates in a modern community can be managed only by a comparatively small number of persons. If we wish the nominations to be representative of our interests and aims, people who are really representative must themselves nominate—whether by "petition," or by self-announced candidature, or by a citizens' committee, matters very little; they must nominate, and they must at the same time take away the causes which make the Boss's control count at present for so much. If the class of men engaged in political life were representative, we should get representative nominations now. But how can they become so? The author has enumerated some of the means. We should add to them everything that could diminish the enormous pecuniary stake which elections keep before the eyes of the greedy and unscrupulous, and especially the control of the Legislature over private and local interests, over cities, corporations, over the tariff. Two hundred million dollars was once given as a fair estimate (p. 150) of the annual incomes represented by patron-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age, local, State, and national. The complete reform of the civil service means the complete removal of this fund as a temptation to the predatory politicians. Cut down the number of elective offices, and cut off the corporate and municipal plunder and the tariff, and the Boss's occupation will be gone; politics will again become a representative career, and nominations will be free. If the view of those who insisted thirty years ago that the abolition of the spoils system was the necessary first step towards this goal was correct, then in another generation, or even sooner, we ought to see the final extinction of the present system of boss encroachments on the right to nominate for office. If they were wrong, then free government on this continent is certainly doomed.

All attempts to avert this fate by legal remedies have hitherto proved unavailing, and, if our analysis is correct, must continue to prove so. Even if we could imagine the primary perfectly protected by legal supervision, it is impossible to compel the good and wise to take part in it, and the real "machine" is only a congeries of voluntary meetings of those who wish to accomplish a certain end. To suppose that those who wish to make a free nomination of the best man for a given office (for this is always the object of an election, so far as the public at large is concerned) can unite in a choice with those who wish to select the tool of a ring, is nonsense, because no two persons who have opposite and conflicting objects in view can unite to carry them out, and no law can enable them to do it. The only thing which those who desire better nominations than the primary produces can do is exactly what they are doing—abandon the primary and nominate for themselves. All that the law can do is to make this easy. We see no reason why the State should not permit any one to be a candidate for any office who will give a bond with sufficient sureties to reimburse the State for the additional expense which his candidature causes. However this may be, there can be no doubt that the more freely men of character and position can come forward and enter into honorable competition with the creatures of the machine for the right to discharge a public trust, the sooner will the grasp of the masters of the latter upon the government be unloosed.

School-Boy Life in England: An American View. By John Corbin. Harper & Bros. 1898.

This is an entertaining and valuable book, but to a superficial or ill-informed reader the entertainment is not unlikely to obscure the real value. The author, from residence at the University of Oxford, and the personal acquaintance which such residence naturally develops with sons of the great English public schools, is able to draw a very vivid, but decidedly rose-colored picture of the occupations, sportive and serious, the temper, and the traditions of those extraordinary institutions. He has selected Winchester, Eton, and Rugby as his special themes; and those among us who fancy that the last of the three overtops all other English schools may be surprised to be told, what is perfectly true, that Winchester is fully the equal of Eton and above Rugby in general English estimation, and that Winchester men say that Arnold's work at Rugby was simply a development of what he learned at Winchester. Mr. Corbin is so enthusiastic to show the noble work of the English schools, with their magnificent traditions, that he seems to ignore the fact that much of this noble work to-day, especially at Winchester, could never be done—indeed, could never have been started—without throwing many traditions and prejudices to the winds. Arnold's Rugby boys made fine men, and so do those trained by his successors; but Arnold's Rugby boys pulled up the stakes set out by Robert Stephenson's surveyors for the Birmingham Railway. The great value of Mr. Corbin's book for Americans lies in his treatment of the extent to which English public schools may serve as models for American boarding-schools. It is admirably handled, and portions of it show a combination of wise candor and wise reserve rare in such discussions.

Mr. Corbin regrets that his space does not allow him to give some account of Harrow, the school of Sheridan, Byron, Peel, and Palmerston. This want is in a manner supplied by 'Old Harrow Days,' by J. G. Cotton-Minchin (London: Methuen & Co.). In this very vivacious and somewhat amusing book the heroes, butts, sports, and triumphs of Harrow are dealt with in the peculiar Harrow tone, which can never be acquired by an outsider, yet will reveal itself fully to every one who has the most superficial acquaintance with Harrovians. It had its culmination in Palmerston: a detestation of hypocrisy that becomes the opposite vice, which Aristotle called "irony"; a strong conviction that an English public-school boy, and particularly a Harrow school boy, is the last triumph of the race, and that if one leaves in the sixth form, the perfect life (as the sensible man would define it) consists in being a sixth-former to the end of your days. There is a personality for praise or ridicule in Harrow talk, and in this book especially, which is often more amusing than considerate. It may raise one's opinion of Harrow's energy, pluck, and steadfastness, but hardly of her gentleness, seriousness, or readiness to learn from others.

Ornamental Design for Woven Fabrics. By C. Stephenson and F. Suddards. London: Methuen & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

The Americans are said to be an ornament-loving people. If this love can only be so chastened that it shall become submissive to simplicity, appropriateness, and restraint, we shall take a great stride in civilization. Far away as such a condition seems to be when one looks at all the miscellaneous ugly and useless objects set out before us in the shops, these are certainly less gaudy and crude and even less useless than the smaller collections of ten or twenty years ago. Much lies in the hands of our manufacturers. If they will give us good designs—designs which are based upon the principles of decoration proved to be sound by centuries of suitable use—we shall learn to like them and to choose them. But the artisans must also be trained and enlightened. To this end it is most encouraging to find not only the technical processes being more thoroughly taught, as in the trade-schools, but that such collections as the Trades Museum in Philadelphia and the excellent beginning made in our city by the Misses Hewitt at the Cooper Union are open to the public, so that men of any class may see examples of technically beautiful productions of other nations and periods. This is what the French have done for a century past. We have heard a couple of men who were painting blinds on a summer-house in France discuss an exhibition of Louis Quinze furniture and appreciate its beautiful qualities with satisfaction and understanding. When may we hope for that here? But we must hope; and as the helps multiply, we shall be nearer to reaching such a condition.

One such aid is the book before us; an excellent, straightforward treatment of the special manufacture of fabrics. Without any waste of fine words, the writers, from the trades colleges at Bradford and Leeds, not only have explained the preparation of designs for each class of fabric, as any practical worker might have done, but have, with taste and judgment, set forth and illustrated the laws of repetition, contrast, variety, symmetry, balance, repose, etc., which govern all good composition. These laws are exemplified by plates from Japanese, Flemish, Spanish, French, and Italian stuffs which are remarkably well chosen for beauty, good arrangement, and technical usefulness. The following of the steps, from the simple line and spot idea through the filling up and elaboration of the plan, is clear and easily comprehensible. In short, the whole work would be instructive reading to any one who wished to learn to know the good from the bad in composition, whether he were buyer, seller, or worker.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Album d'Antiquités Orientales. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Almanach de Gotha. 1898. Gotha: Justus Perthes; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Battershall, Rev. W. W. Interpretations of Life and Religion. A. S. Barnes & Co. $1.50.
Child Memorial Volume. [Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Vol. V.] Boston: Ginn & Co.
Clark, Rev. G. W. Romans and Corinthians. [A People's Commentary.] Philadelphia: Baptist Publication Society. $1.25.
Cortina, R. D. Verbos Españoles. 5th ed. R. D. Cortina.
Downer, A. C. The Odes of Keats. With Notes and Analyses, and a Memoir. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde.
Drummond, Henry. The Ideal Life. Addresses Hitherto Unpublished. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.
Drummond, Henry. The Monkey That Would Not Kill. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.
Dubois, Abbé J. A. Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde.
Fincham, H. W. Artists and Engravers of British and American Book-Plates. Dodd, Mead & Co. $5.
Goode, G. B. The Smithsonian Institution, 1846-1896. Published by the City of Washington.
Gorion, M. Mémoires. Paris: Ernest Flammarion; New York: Brentanos.
Grinnell, G. B., and Roosevelt, Theodore. Trail and Camp-Fire. Forest and Stream Publishing Co. $2.50.
Haliburton: A Centenary Chaplet. Toronto: William Briggs. $1.25.
Huntington, A. M. A Note-Book in Northern Spain. Illustrated. Putnams. $3.50.
Ireland, W. A. Demerariana: Essays, Historical, Critical, and Descriptive. Georgetown, Demerara: Baldwin & Co.
Johnson, C. F. What Can I Do for Brady? and Other Verses. Whittaker. $1.
Kellogg, Eva M. C. Australia and the Islands of the Sea. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co.
Mariotte-Davies, Prof. P. An Elementary Scientific French Reader. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 40c.
Newcomb, C. B. All's Right with the World. Boston: Philosophical Publishing Co. $1.50.
Orr, Charles. History of the Pequot War. Cleveland, O.: Helman-Taylor Co.
Porter, Rose. Daily Souvenirs. For My Lady's Desk. New York: E. R. Herrick & Co. Each $1.
Postgate, J. P. Silva Manniana. Cambridge: University Press.
Rand, T. H. At Minas Basin, and Other Poems. 2d ed. Toronto: William Briggs.
Scott, F. G. The Unnamed Lake, and Other Poems. Toronto: William Briggs.
Stickney, J. H. Earth and Sky: A First Grade Nature Reader. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Trübner, K. Minerva: Jahrbuch der Gelehrten Welt. 1897-1898. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Van Siclen, G. W. Bearing of the Greater New York Charter on Real-Estate Interests. Record and Guide Publishing Co.
Van Siclen, G. W. Promissory Notes, Checks, Bills of Exchange, Bonds. The New York Negotiable Instruments Law of Oct. 1, 1897. Record and Builders' Guide. $1.80.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED